FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 090 11 May 1987

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Reagan Statement on Draft Arms Proposal Cited AA 1
Proposal Studied AA 1
Shultz Article on Prospective INF Agreements Cited AA 2
U.S. Resorts to 'Cunning' at Geneva Talks [Zorin] AA 2
New Gorbachev Disarmament Plan Revealed [Hamburg BILD 11 May] AA 3
Zholkver on European Cooperation, Security Week AA 4

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Gerasimov on Rivalry With U.S., Disarmament CC 1
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Grigoryev, Tsoppi, Charikov] CC 2
Scientists, Diplomats Discuss Nuclear War CC 9

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Work on 'Stealth' Bomber Said Intensified A 1
Reagan Radio Address Focuses on Arms Bills A 1
Authorities 'Conceal' Nuclear Test Accident A 2
Spokesman 'Unprepared' To Discuss Brazinskas A 2
U.S. Aims at 'Curtailing' Japanese-Soviet Trade [Biryukov] A 3
U.S. Press Cited on CIA Links With Saudi Arabia A 4
CIA 'Manipulates' Congress for Mujahidin Funding A 4
CIA Forms 'Nicaraguan Resistance' Group [Chigir] A 5
Zorin Comments on 'Irangate' Investigation A 6

NORTHEAST ASIA

Moscow on 'True Purpose' of Japan-S. Korea Talks [(Yurskiy)] C 1
Soviet 'Source' on Recognition of N., S. Korea [KUNA] C 2
U.S.-S. Korea Consultations End in Washington C 2
DPRK Calls for North-South Role in Olympic Games C 3

SOUTH ASIA

Iran Continues 'Unfriendly' Statements on USSR D 1
Commentary on Iran's Treatment of Afghan Refugees [Vyatkin] D 1
DRA's Wakil Holds News Conference on Reconciliation D 2

WESTERN EUROPE

FRG's Weizsaecker To Pay Official Visit 6-11 June G 1
Turkish General Staff Official Welcomed in Moscow G 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 May]
Pre-Visit Coverage of Chirac Visit to Moscow G 1
Kamentsev Discusses Visit G 1
Chirac Interviewed G 1
Briefs: Soviet-Finnish Computers G 4

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Soviet Ship Attacked in Persian Gulf 6 May H 1
Further Report [Kuwait] H 1
Iran's Rejection of Cease-Fire Proposal Noted H 2
[Radio Peace and Progress]
Saudi Arabia Orders Arrest of Khashuqji H 3

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Politburo Discusses Domestic, International Issues R 1
PRAVDA Reports Examine Recent CPSU Decisions R 3
'Labor, Social Discipline' [4 May] R 3
'Sociocultural' Construction [5 May] R 5
Further Reportage on Writers' Union Plenum R 7
Paper Carries Resolution R 7
[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 6 May]
Kunyayev Addresses Board R 12
[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 6 May]
Feliks Kuznetsov Speaks R 15
[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 6 May]
Oleynik on 'Developments' R 17
[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 6 May]
Zalygin: 'Questions' To Paise R 21
[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 6 May]
Mikhaylov Criticizes Paper R 22
[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 6 May]
Prokhanov: 'Negative Culture' R 23
[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 6 May]
Deputy Prosecutor S.A. Shiskov Dies [IZVESTIYA 4 May] R 25

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Reportage of Victory Day Anniversary Observance V 1
Sokolov Article [PRAVDA 9 May] V 1
Lushev Address V 6
Tretyak Interview V 9

REAGAN STATEMENT ON DRAFT ARMS PROPOSAL CITED

LD081919 Moscow TASS in English 1909 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] Washington May 8 TASS -- The White House announced today that the American delegation presented on May 8 a draft treaty on reducing the strategic offensive weapons of the USSR and the USA at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons.

In today's written statement President Reagan pointed out that the American proposals were the result of intensive work of all U.S. governmental departments concerned and received his approval. Describing this draft treaty as an important indicator of the U.S. wish to reach major, equal and verifiable reductions in strategic armaments as soon as possible President Reagan stressed that he did not want to play down the existing complex problems.

In particular, the head of the White House described as totally unacceptable any proposals restricting the scale of the Star Wars programme whose implementation the USA is speeding up. Reagan said that he would not agree to any measures which would hamper or kill the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Proposal Studied

LD081852 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1759 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] Geneva, 8 May (TASS) -- The Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons are continuing in Geneva.

The Soviet delegation is pursuing a consistent course aimed at successfully completing the preparations for a joint draft treaty on the problem of medium-range missiles (INF), and at ensuring progress in other areas of the talks as well. Objectively, all the necessary conditions exist for this. These have been created by the important accords reached by the leaders of the USSR and the United States in Reykjavik, and also by the new initiatives recently undertaken by the Soviet Union in all the spheres being scrutinized at the Geneva talks.

On 5 May of this year the Soviet delegation took another constructive step -- it proposed the coordination of "the key provisions of agreements" on a number of major disarmament problems, including strategic offensive weapons (SOW) and the reinforcement of the regime of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM). The Soviet side has presented an appropriate draft document. Together with an INF treaty this document could become the subject and principal result of a political accord at the summit level [na vysshem urovne] between the USSR and the United States, as well as a basis for preparing complete-format [polnoformatnyy] legally binding agreements.

The Soviet delegation also suggested agreeing to principles of restraint in the sphere of strategic offensive arms, including long-range sea-based cruise missiles, for the duration of the talks. This would mean the sides would refrain from exceeding currently existing levels of strategic offensive arms. The sense and importance of such a step are evident. It would create a favorable climate for the work of the delegations and for the preparation of agreements to limit and reduce arms.

The U.S. delegation has now submitted the U.S. draft treaty on strategic offensive arms. It will be studied. A number of its clauses take into account the accord reached in Reykjavik on a radical reduction of strategic offensive arms by both sides.

However, there is in the U.S. draft treaty a complete absence of a most important element: Consideration of the objectively existing mutual link between reductions in strategic offensive arms, prevention of the arms race in space, and the strengthening of the ABM Treaty regime.

The Soviet delegation stated firmly in this regard that preventing the arms race from emerging into space and preserving the ABM Treaty regime is a key problem for implementing the 50 percent reductions in strategic offensive arms. A clause is therefore needed when there is an accord on the reduction of strategic offensive arms, that if either of the sides decides to embark on the practical creation [sozdaniye] of an ABM system in space, the other side will have the right to consider itself free of the obligation to reduce strategic offensive arms.

The USSR delegation intends to continue trying to achieve in Geneva solutions that fully correspond to the agreed aim of the talks: to prevent the arms race in space, limit and reduce nuclear arms on earth, strengthen strategic stability, and ultimately liquidate nuclear weapons completely and universally.

SHULTZ ARTICLE ON PROSPECTIVE INF AGREEMENT CITED

LD110737 Moscow TASS in English 0713 GMT 11 May 87

[Text] New York May 11 TASS -- U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz contributed an article to the weekly "TIME", devoted to prospects for concluding a Soviet-U.S. agreement on eliminating intermediate-range missiles from Europe.

Shultz believes that the United States and the USSR "appear to be nearing an agreement on intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF)". "Such an agreement is not assured -- our negotiators still have important work before them -- but if it is concluded, it would constitute the first time in 25 years of U.S.-Soviet arms control talks that significant and verifiable reductions in any category of offensive nuclear weapons had taken place".

Shultz stressed that the administration regarded such an agreement as being in U.S. interests. Shultz opposed the attempts "to link an INF agreement to conventional force reductions" by the Warsaw Treaty member states, stressing that this would be tantamount to killing an agreement. He argued, however, that there existed an "imbalance" in this field between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty.

It is clear from the U.S. secretary of state's article that Washington and its allies do not intend to abandon the doctrine of "flexible response" underlying the NATO's strategy, which is known to stipulate the launching of a first nuclear strike.

"Even after an INF agreement, NATO would retain a robust deterrent," he writes. "More than 4,000 U.S. nuclear weapons would still be in Europe".

U.S. RESORTS TO 'CUNNING' AT GENEVA TALKS

LD082012 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 8 May 87

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] Reports from Geneva on progress in the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons are attracting the attention of the mass media throughout the world and are being published in the most prominent places.

Perhaps special attention is now being paid to the part of the talks devoted to drawing up a draft agreement on medium-range nuclear missiles. On that score one cannot but focus on the fact that U.S. corresponents in Geneva, evidently served by members of their delegation, are pursuing this tack in their reports: An agreement on removing U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles from Europe is near completion, and success in this direction depends on the Soviet Union.

That the first serious breakthrough in the nuclear missile race that has lasted through the postwar decades is within nearer reach than ever before, and that, provided there is goodwill, a corresponding agreement may be signed in the not too distant future, by all accounts reflects the genuine state of affairs. However, I think that for the time being there are no grounds for excessive euphoria on that score -- through no fault of the Soviet Union.

As far as the Soviet side is concerned, it has done all in its power to eliminate medium-range missiles in Europe. Unfortunately, one cannot say that about Washington's position yet. While assuring the public of its readiness for a positive resolution of the problem the U.S. delegation in Geneva is, at the same time, piling up most definite obstacles on the path to a solution of that problem. I will cite this example: While agreeing that the Pershing-2 missiles are just the type of weapon the removal of which from positions in Europe is being discussed, wise men from the Pentagon have invented the following trick -- you cannot call it anything but that. We will remove not the whole of the Pershing-2 missile, they say, but only one of its two parts. Then that missile will have not a medium radius of action, but a limited one.

What is cunning about that? Well, first, during that operation all the complex infrastructure will be preserved: the launch positions, the equipment, and so on, which were set up during the siting [razmeshcheniye] of Pershing-2 missiles in Europe. Second, all in all 48 hours are required for the reverse operation, that is, joining the previously removed second stage to the first stage. Inasmuch as all the launchers will, according to the Pentagon's plan, remain untouched, the intended plan is akin to the cunning of the monk who tried to convert pigs into crabs [perekrestit porosya v karasya]. The essecne of the plan is to preserve the offensive capability of the U.S. medium-range missiles, if in a disguised form, at the same time as the Soviet Union has to remove its SS-25 missiles from its launch positions. The very attempt by the U.S. side to act with cunning in the resolution of such vitally important problems cannot but arouse the anxiety of the public. All the more since this is not the only piece of cunning the U.S. delegation is restoring to these days at the talks.

Of course, its is premature to draw a conclusion as to whether it is a case of diplomatic maneuvering by the U.S. delegation, or whether an attempt is actually being made seriously to drag out the solution of the problem, the bases for which were laid in Reykjavik and discussed during the recent visit of Secretary of State Shultz to Moscow. Washington's real intentions, and accordingly, the possibility of achieving an accord on medium-range missiles, will become known in the next few weeks.

NEW GORBACHEV DISARMAMENT PLAN REVEALED

DW110820 Hamburg BILD in German 11 May 87 pp 1,12

[Report by "H.-E.B.": "Gorbachev to Reagan: Withdraw All Troops"]

[Text] The Americans and the Russians would withdraw their troops from all of Eastern and Western Europe. That is what Soviet Communist Party chief Gorbachev wants to propose to the West at a Warsaw Pact summit meeting in late May in East Berlin.

According to information obtained by BILD, Western intelligence services and diplomats have informed their governments in Washington, Bonn, and London, as well as NATO, about Gorbachev's most spectacular disarmament plans to date.

According to them, the Soviets would have to withdraw 380,000 soldiers from the "GDR," 80,000 from the CSSR, 65,000 from Hungary, and 40,000 from Poland. The Americans have 310,000 GI's stationed in Western Europe, 250,000 of them in the FRG and in West Berlin.

Gorbachev considers his plan a fulfillment of the Western demand to dismantle the Warsaw Pact's conventional preponderance. Western diplomats and military representatives are already working on responses. They are skeptical. The Americans would have to withdraw their soldiers across the Atlantic. The Soviets, however, would bring their troops back to their own territory, just a few hours away by rail.

ZHOLKVER ON EUROPEAN COOPERATION, SECURITY WEEK

LD082121 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] A week of action for security and cooperation in Europe begins today. Political observer Aleksander Zholkver comments:

At our meetings of veterans of the last war, the thought repeated most frequently is that our children must never have to know the flames of war. The best way to make this wich come true is by the active participation of each of us in the struggle for peace, whether in our own jobs or among those who get together for antiwar protest demonstrations. Particularly favorable opportunities have now arisen for undertaking effective measures to make our common European home more comfortable and secure.

It is possible to scrap the entire class of most dangerous armaments in Europe. The way toward this has been opened up by our proposals to eliminate all nuclear missiles on the European Continent. These proposals are being actively supported by the socialist states of Europe. They have been approved by the West European socialist and social democratic parties, whose congress was held recently in Portugal. The participants of the spring peace marches -- which numbered a great many people in many countries of Western Europe -- spoke out in support of our initiatives.

What are the governments of these countries engaged in at present? So far they have been discussing, meeting and consulting. It has been officially announced that the NATO Council meeting just held in Brussels was part of these consultations. It goes without saying that the matter of eliminating Euromissiles is an important problem, and everything should be weighed up and thought over. Yet is this thinking process not being dragged out for far too long. And in which direction is it developing? In Bonn, for example, Chancellor Kohl's government statement of yesterday was very ambiguous. Medium-range missiles may be, as it were, scrapped, whereas short-range missiles should be retained. In Paris and London they simply advocate the idea of retaining the strategy of nuclear deterrance.

However, times are changing: Even THE WASHINGTON POST states that NATO strategy needs changing: The main thing however, is that in Europe -- the NATO countries included -- political thinking is changing. Even conservative politicians are beginning to realize the absence of prospects in and the danger of a policy which relies only on strength in our nuclear missile age. Meanwhile, restructuring in our country is destroying the myth of the Soviet threat which has been studiously spread by Western propaganda. So I think there is good reason to suppose that this year the week of action for security and cooperation in Europe will be particularly effective.

KARPOV INTERVIEWED ON SHULTZ TALKS, DRAFT TREATY

WA061830 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 17, 4 May 87 pp 6-8

[Interview with Viktor Karpov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Department for Arms Limitation and Disarmament, by reporter Nikita Zholkver: "Formula for Success -- Europe Without Missiles"; date not given]

[Text] [Zholkver] The final press conference of the U.S. Secretary of State caused many to take a hopeful view. Although controversial issues clearly remain, changes for the better would appear to outweigh them. Or are you of a different opinion?

[Karpov] I would not say that. I think that in any case it may be said that there is hope. Hope for the conclusion of an agreement with the U.S. on a question of great importance not only for our bilateral relations, but also for universal security, for removing the threat of nuclear war.

Our approach is this: whatever the complications in our relations, whatever the problems, often artificially created by the American side -- like the recent charges of spying on the U.S. embassy -- this should not overshadow the main thing -- the need to search for solutions in matters connected with nuclear arms in space, ending nuclear tests, and reducing the armed forces and armaments in Europe.

Here some headway has been made. But I should like to draw your attention to the fact that the credit for this goes primarily to the Soviet Union, although the Secretary of State wished to create the impression that it was thanks to his visit to Moscow. What was achieved during the talks George Shultz had with Mikhail Gorbachev, Nikolay Ryzhkov and Eduard Shevardnadze reflects the efforts made by the Soviet side to place the negotiations on a practical footing. And above all, in a sphere which, as Reykjavik showed, is the most promising, namely, that of medium-range missiles in Europe.

We still stand by the Reykjavik formula. The U.S. also agrees that this formula should be the basis of a future agreement. However, of late the U.S. has been laying emphasis on the question of shorter-range missiles -- from 500 to 1,000 kilometres -- being settled simultaneously with that of medium-range missiles. We have taken a major step towards meeting that position: if the question of operational-tactical missiles could in any way impede agreement on medium-range missiles, we are ready to remove that obstacle by doing away with our operational-tactical missiles in Europe, unilaterally and in a comparatively brief and clearly specified time. It would be a good thing if the U.S. Secretary of State gave an equally clear-cut explanation of our position to the NATO allies of the United States whom he went to meet straight from Moscow.

[Zholkver] Judging by the initial reports from Brussels, George Shultz gave the NATO Council a somewhat vague account of his talks in Moscow. And Washington's West European partners too displayed no particular enthusiasm. What else is there to prevent an early achievement of agreement on medium-range missiles in linkage with operational-tactical missiles?

[Karpov] It seems to me that objectively there are no obstacles to agreement. Unless, of course, they are artificially created. The basic thesis of the Americans before Shultz went to Moscow was this: the Russians, it was contended, have the advantage in operational-tactical missiles. And until that advantage is eliminated by a buildup of these missiles by the United States, there can be no agreement on medium-range missiles. Because supposedly the Soviet Union would gain by it. Now that dubious argument has lost all meaning.

[Zholkver] The other day Volker Ruhe, CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] deputy floor leader in the West German Bundestag, known to NEW TIMES readers for his contributions to our magazine, wrote in the newspaper HAMBURGER ANZEIGER that "the Soviet Union has a tenfold superiority over the West as regards missiles with a range from 150 to 1,000 kilometres."

[Karpov] The question of missiles with a range of less than 500 km has little to do with what was actually discussed in the talks between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. Why was this done? It is one of two things -- either it is just another trial balloon to see whether the talks could be hampered by raising this angle, or else the author of the article simply did not know what he was writing about.

The problem of tactical missiles with a range of up to 500 kilometres also figures in the Soviet proposals. Mikhail Gorbachev said quite plainly that the U.S.S.R. is prepared to do away with them. The collective proposals advanced by the Warsaw Treaty countries on this score were formulated as far back as June last year in the Budapest appeal thus: tactical nuclear weapons would be reduced in step with the disbandment of the army formations equipped with such missiles. As Mikhail Gorbachev said, we now are prepared to go still further -- towards the complete liquidation of weapons of this class. And so Ruhe's sally clearly misses the mark.

[Zholkver] It seems to me that what adds to the confusion of people not particularly well versed in military technology is the diversity of designations given to the various categories of missiles -- medium-range, shorter-range, intermediate-range, operational-tactical and regional. Could you perhaps clarify the classifications -- both Soviet and American?

[Karpov] It is a matter of difference of approach. In our terminology there are intercontinental strategic missiles with a range of 5,500 kilometres and more, medium-range missiles from 1,000 up to 5,500 kilometres, operational-tactical -- from 500 to 1,000 kilometres, and tactical missiles with a range of less than 500 kilometres.

In NATO terminology there are intercontinental ballistic missiles -- this definition coincides with our own, but then come the longer-range intermediate missiles (1,800-5,500 km), and shorter-range intermediate missiles (1,800-500 km). Missiles with a range of less than 500 kilometres are called tactical missiles -- here, too, the definitions coincide.

[Zholkver] Could the differences in classification not be an obstacle to agreement?

[Karpov] Why should they be? After all, there is the perfectly concrete criterion of range. I will say this -- given the desire to reach agreement, terminological discrepancies should not be an obstacle.

[Zholkver] Judging by statements made by U.S. leaders, the United States would be interested in the complete liquidation of medium-range missiles. Why does the Soviet Union insist on both sides retaining 100 warheads each?

[Karpov] Because we cannot but take into account the fact that the United States has nuclear weapons in the Asian-Pacific region. It has there hundreds, I repeat, hundreds of delivery means for nuclear weapons -- missiles and aircraft. Moreover, some of them are located in direct proximity to the territory of the Soviet Union. For instance, a base for F-16 aircraft -- those up-to-date means of delivery of nucler weapons -- has been set up and is being expanded at Misawa, on Honshu Island.

In South Korea the U.S. has begun deploying tactical nuclear weapons -- so far, the Lance missile with a range of 130 kilometres. But there is no guarantee that they will not be replaced by longer-range missiles. Clearly, we must have a potential that would serve as a counterweight. If the United States is ready to talk about a mutual reduction and the elimination of these potentials we shall not object.

[Zholkver] It looks as if we are giving the United States a "present" by allowing it to have 100 warheads on its territory. After all, the hundred in the Asian part of the U.S.S.R., as you say, are not a counterweight to them.

[Karpov] Let me explain. We say -- and this must be an indispensable condition of an agreement -- that the warheads on the medium-range missiles the U.S. will retain on its territory must not be able to reach the territory of the Soviet Union. We categorically insist on this condition being observed. And for this reason. At the present time there are no medium-range missiles in the U.S. capable of reaching Soviet territory. Just as we have no medium-range missiles capable of reaching U.S. territory.

If, after we reduce our medium-range missiles in the Asian part of our country, the United States should simultaneously deploy 100 warheads capable of reaching our territory, the agreement aimed at scaling down the nuclear confrontation between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. would, on the contrary, heighten that confrontation. We hold that this would not accord with the Soviet Union's security interests.

[Zholkver] To return to Europe, and in particular to the position of Britain and France. The public pronouncements of official spokesmen of these two nuclear powers reveal a clearly negative attitude to the prospect of a nuclear-free Europe, an unwillingness to include the British and French nuclear forces in the negotiating process. But, after all, one cannot close one's eyes indefinitely not only to the existence of these potentials but to the fact that they are being built up.

[Karpov] True. When we took the step that opens the way to the elimination of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe we were taking a certain risk. But this does not mean that our proposals overlook the existence of the French and British nuclear potentials. Certainly not. We believe that the elimination of the Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe should be the first step towards the elimination of all nuclear weapons in that continent. And of course both Britain and France should join in this process. In the programme for nuclear disarmament put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev on January 15, 1986, this is envisaged as the second stage -- after the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. have carried out a 50 per cent reduction of their nuclear arsenals.

[Zholkver] In the course of the talks George Shultz had in Moscow the problem of SDI was touched upon. In this connection there is talk about some change in the Soviet position with regard to the "Star Wars" programme. What is new in Moscow's approach to this question?

[Karpov] Essentially, it is a further development of the position of which we spoke earlier. In Reykjavik, for instance. The substance remains unchanged: the Soviet Union favours strict and complete observance of the ABM Treaty. U.S. officials have come out with a new interpretation of the treaty (the so-called "broad" interpretation), for which, incidentally, there is no justification whatever, either in the text of the treaty itself or in the agreed statements appended to it, or in the history of the negotiations themselves.

Since October 1985, when the U.S. first began to speak of the "broad" interpretation, a certain difference of opinion as regards the understanding of the treaty has emerged. We say to the United States: let us remove all differences as regards the limits that must not be overstepped in research, development and testing of the means of anti-missile defence. To this end let our experts determine what, in order not to violate the ABM Treaty, must not be placed in outer space for testing or deployment purposes.

The Americans either evade the issue or categorically object to any such suggestion. This is understandable. It does not suit their purpose, for any discussion of the limits of the permissible raises doubts as to the validity of their "broad" interpretation of the treaty. We understand this. But if there is to be an identical, mutually-shared and indeed the only acceptable interpretation of the treaty, the procedure we propose for agreeing the positions of the two sides is indispensable.

The Americans complained that we did not make it clear what we meant by restricting things to "laboratory limits." We have explained now that what is meant is not only research institutes with doors bearing the sign "Laboratory," but also proving grounds and factory testing facilities where such tests are carried out. And what, above all, must be excluded is violation of Article 5 of the treaty, which bans the development, testing and deployment of space-based ABM systems or components. For this it is very important to determine what devices must not be placed in outer space for testing or deployment purposes.

[Zholkver] What tests are not prohibited by the treaty? What will be tried out on these proving grounds?

[Karpov] ABM components may be tested, provided they are intended for replacements permitted by the treaty. We are allowed to have 100 anti-missile missiles, 100 launchers and a certain number of radar stations around Moscow. Testing of a device, even if it is not an exact copy of what we already have, but let us say a laser device intended to replace a launcher or an anti-missile missile, is permitted. But only in a stationary, on-the-ground version. This the treaty does not forbid.

[Zholkver] Does this not make it possible to test components of a future ABM space system without putting them into orbit?

[Karpov] Theoretically, an anti-missile missile can be deployed in outer space. For this it is necessary to orbit a statellite platform and mount anti-missile missiles on it. This can be done even without space tests. Lasers can also be tested in an artificial vacuum on the ground or in the atmosphere with a certain adjustment. There are no restrictions on this kind of testing.

The trouble is, however, that it is necessary to make the laser part of the space-based ABM system, to develop the technology of putting it in orbit, and ensure it the necessary power supply. But all this is not simple. In order to have a guarantee that the laser system for combating ballistic missiles will function in outer space, it has to be tested in space.

[Zholkver] The next round of the Soviet-American negotiations begins in Geneva on April 23. Of course, there is no point in anticipating events and making optimistic predictions. But what does Moscow expect of the coming round?

[Karpov] The working group dealing with medium-range missiles resumes discussions on April 23. It will continue to work on the drafting of a joint text of a treaty on the elimination of the Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe and corresponding limitations in the Asian part of the U.S.S.R. and in the territory of the United States. We are working on a compromise draft taking into account the U.S. position and offering solutions on questions which have given rise to disagreement and different interpretations. We hope that this draft will open the way to completing the work on the treaty.

[Zholkver] Could there be a new summit meeting this year?

[Karpov] As a matter of fact, we are proposing such a meeting. But it must be productive. Specifically, we propose that a draft of a treaty on medium-range missiles be prepared for the summit, at which it would be signed, and that at the same time a document be drawn up that would contain if not the full texts of agreements on space and on offensive strategic arms, then at least the groundwork for such agreements.

We have already handed the Americans a draft of the key provisions of these agreements. It provides for fully guaranteed observance of the ABM Treaty for a period of ten years, without giving the sides the right to invoke Article 15 under which withdrawal from the treaty is allowed in extraordinary circumstances. The draft also contains the formula of a 50 per cent reduction in strategic arms which is based fully on the Reykjavik formula. And, lastly, the draft includes the proposal to begin full-scale talks on ending nuclear tests. If our proposals are approved by the American side they could determine the content and outcome of a meeting at summit level. In that case the road to Washington will be open.

GERASIMOV ON RIVALRY WITH U.S. DISARMAMENT

LD101808 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 May 87

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Text] Simple human forgetfulness, according to the formula that everything passes [vse prokhodit] is neither the only nor the chief reason for our former U.S. ally's memory failure. The emergence of this blind spot in his eye, which destroys his historical view, is primarily the result of many years of cultivating the image of the enemy there, in the person of you and me. Now, under the new conditions of openness and democratization, this enemy image is being eroded. The more frankness [otkrovennost] we have in discussing our development problems, the more understandable our goals and priorities are to the rest of the world. The further we go to meet the West halfway, with the aim of eliminating its misgivings about our intentions -- even while knowing that these misgivings are fabricated -- the harder it will be to use us to frighten people there.

For the past few weeks, the West has been talking of nothing but the Soviet proposals for eliminating medium-range and operational and tactical missiles in Europe. If one removes oneself from the play of arguments and counterarguments -- you probably know these from the daily news -- the matter boils down to maintaining mistrust in us. What on earth have we thought up now? It is impossible that some sort of one-sided advantages are not concealed somewhere in the Soviet proposals, and so they are looking hard.

This is the old-fashioned way of thinking, regarding our relations, relations between East and West, as relations of head-on, strict rivalry. Meanwhile it is high time to think about cooperation in how to avert the universal nuclear danger.

Well, all the observers in the West write that we have the initiative. Recently a strategic review was published, drawn up by the International Institute of Strategic Studies in London. I do not remember seeing such a self-critical review for many years; it is published every year. Here is what you can read in it: The Soviet Union's new, dynamic leader has achieved his first successes in his attempts to bring Soviet policy out of its frozen state. He can be expected to portray Soviet policy in many other areas in a new and more positive light, thereby challenging the wisdom and will of the weakened U.S. Government, where there is an evident lack of fresh ideas and progressive processes.

As you can see, the authors of the strategic review are arguing in the platitudes of rivalry: Well, we get a good mark, while the United States gets a barely satisfactory one. So, we should probably be pleased about it. We are indeed having successes in the diplomatic and propaganda offensive; we do not deny these, of course. But our goal is not this transient and separate one. The goal should be a common one: the search for ways toward disarmament.

A paradoxical situation is coming out over our proposals on medium-range and operational and tactical missiles. Putting it schematically: the United States is manifesting rather greater readiness in this respect than Western Europe is. When Western Europe expresses fears that without these missiles, it will be left virtually weaponless, it is reminded -- not by Moscow but by the Pentagon -- that even after the proposed cuts, there will be 4,600 units of nuclear weapons left in NATO countries. Well of course, voices against can be heard in the United States, too, proving the presence there of people opposing all agreements on principle.

These people are afraid of the very start of a movement toward nuclear disarmament. For if there is an agreement on medium-range missiles and on operational and tactical misiles, then for the first time in all history, opposing sides will start eliminating weapons, actually reducing weapons and not simply limiting them. So these people are afraid of the first step. What starts an avalance of nuclear disarmament?

Well, Margaret Thatcher, Jacques Chirac, and Helmut Kohl are having consultations, but just cannot come to any final decision. Kohl, for example, was supposed to do that in a government statement on disarmament problems on 7 May, but he did not take any position, and said that he would merely sum up the interim result. In this interim result, Kohl -- like many others -- reiterated the arguments about the superiority of the Warsaw Pact countries in conventional weapons and spoke about the ability of the Warsaw Pact countries to invade Western Europe.

It is at least a good thing that there is less talk now about intentions regarding an invasion, but fears in regard to the capability of carrying out an invasion are still being repeated. It is added that in politics, one should proceed not from intentions -- these are subjective, just try and check -- but from the capabilities; these are objective and can be used. But, the Warsaw Pact is open for discussion on this issue, as well, in regard to capabilities. The NATO countries were invited to discussion at the last session of the Political Consultative Committee [PCC] of the Warsaw Pact member countries. This was held last summer in Budapest. The next PCC session will be held soon. Just the day before yesterday, Poland came forward with specific proposals to reduce military confrontation in Europe, precisely in connection with reducing the capability of invasion on both one side and the other.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD101920 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 10 May 87

["International Observers Roundtable" program with TASS political observer Aleksey Nikolayevich Grigoryev, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI commentator Viktor Aleksandrovich Tsoppi, and All-Union Radio commentator Igor Pavlovich Charikov]

[Text] [Charikov] Hello, esteemed comrades. We would like to begin today's discussion with the event that was marked yesterday by our country's people, the people of the rest of Europe and, indeed, the people of the whole world: The 42d anniversary of the defeat of Hitlerite fascism, a date inscribed forever in the history of many states. With the years, the significance of that event becomes ever more palpable and ever more important; with every year that passes, we feel more and more concretely and more and more tangibly how that event is linked with the present.

[Grigoryev] I think May, 1945 -- and every May thereafter -- inevitably directs our gaze toward the land where the most horrific and terrible war in human history ended: the land of Germany, where, as a result of postwar development, two independent German states have arisen. I have been lucky enough to spend quite a long time working in each of them: in the GDR for 4 years and more than 6 years in West Germany. Therefore my impressions of what has been happening on German soil, in both German states, are colored by my own personal view.

When I think of the liberation festival that is celebrated on 8 May every year by the masses of the people in the GDR, I picutre not only what we know -- from history, from books and documents, about how the political and other -- economic and moral -- roots of fascism were extirpated in that country, in that republic:

I also see the people who grew up in socialist Germany; I see the people who are our brothers and friends, people who keep sacred the memory of the liberators. There is not only the majestic memorial in Treptow Park, but also a multitude of other monuments to our soldiers. One that I can never forget is the wing of one of our aircraft, imbedded in the earth, on which the names of the crew, who perished in the very last days of the war, have actually been carved as with a chisel.

There are a great many such monuments in the GDR, and one wants to speak of them today. But the main thing, of course, is that the GDR is a state that has become a considerable factor in maintaining peace in Europe. When we talk and think about the past, we also have to think, of course, of today and of the contribution by both Germanies to ensuring that war never again comes to the world from German soil, and indeed that there are no more wars at all, either in Europe or in the world. I have already mentioned the GDR. One may recall the many peace proposals that have originated in the GDR, from the GDR itself as well as from other socialist countries. The West German leaders also have much to say: We hear many statements from them that war must not come from German soil and that the FRG has a very great interest in preserving peace. But unfortunately, often when you hear words, you begin to think of deeds; and nothing much has been done.

[Tsoppi] Now the moment of truth has come, when we have a chance to rid Europe of nuclear weapons, and here is where the West German position reveals itself.

[Grigoryev] Here it is unfortunately all too clear. The FRG is the only country in Western Europe where U.S. Pershing-2 medium-range missiles are sited, as well as practically the overwhelming majority of the cruise missiles. Well, it is the United States that has deployed [razmestit] these weapons. They are U.S. weapons, but nonetheless, all this has been done with the West German Government's consent.

Now a chance has been offered in our proposals made by Comrade Gorbachev: to destroy medium-range missiles in Europe, all of them; to destroy cruise missiles. We will speak later about the U.S. reaction, but what of the FRG's reaction, above all, of its government, the ruling party, Chancellor Kohl? He has repeatedly -- and recently -- said that official Bonn is in favor of removing medium-range missiles from Europe.

As for the operational and tactical missiles, which we have also proposed removing, here Bonn's position becomes vague, like a blurred photograph. Then what? Then follows talk, from very senior people, too, that U.S. nuclear weapons should not be withdrawn from the FRG at all, because -- and here I quote Defense Minister Woerner -- the Warsaw Pact has three times the conventional weapons of the unfortunate West. They strike up the old tune. At one time they were saying: Accept President Reagan's zero option. I remember taking part in so many television discussions on this subject, at which my Western colleagues bombarded me with the question: Well why do you not accept the zero option? We accepted the zero option; more than that, we went further and proposed removing the operational and tactical missiles. But no: again, this is being hemmed in with all sorts of reservations. The Federal Republic is trying with every possible means to put off this decision and drown it in interminable discussion. I am talking now of the ruling parties, and actually even of the third coalition, because the Free Democrats, to give them their due, are taking a realistic attitude. The Social Democrats support the Soviet proposals even more actively. Well, they are an opposition party like the Greens. Naturally, innumerable public organizations and the German Communist Party, advocate solving this problem as quickly as possible.

Well, when you read the press, listen to the radio, and meet FRG representatives who come to Moscow, you see how strong, after all, are the forces on which the decision depends.

I mentioned Defense Minister Woerner; then there is the Chairman of the Parliamentary CDU [Christian Democratic Union] Dragger, and a lot of other figures in West Germany, and not only there, but in NATO, too: General Rogers, who is also sounding the alarm and shouting that Europe must on no account be deprived of this nuclear umbrella or whatever you like to call it -- shield, umbrella, or whatever -- though in fact it is a spear, again, appealing to and tying up with this problem, the question of conventional armaments, and so on, and so on.

[Charikov] In one way or another, we are getting nowhere in solving the question. Having received our latest proposal, the United States said in reply that they will give us their answer only after very thorough consultations with their allies. One of the major allies, the FRG, in the person of the Kohl government, seems to be answering negatively, as I understand it.

[Tsoppi] Or at least has not yet given a positive answer.

[Charikov] Has not given a postive answer. And the French?

[Tsoppi] Yes. I get the general impression that today, roles are being distributed like this: The Soviet Union and the United States are conducting negotiations in Geneva, elucidating their positions, seeking approaches that will be mutually acceptable to each other; meanwhile, U.S. NATO allies have been allocated the role, as it were, of inhibiting centers. Of course, it is all in the sphere of demagogy -- all this about the United States being obliged to consult their allies about everything before they can make a decision that concerns the whole of the free world. We know plenty of examples from history where there were no consultations at all and the United States simply told Western Europe what to do.

[Charikov] Incidentally, when George Shultz brought out this phrase at his news conference -- he said: We will go to Brussels and consult our allies about our answer; We are members of the Atlantic Alliance -- a sort of ironic whisper went around the hall.

[Tsoppi] Yes. So this common decision of the whole bloc, as it were, naturally depends not only on West Germany but also on the other NATO allies. I personally find the French position very worrying. The position of France -- which, as you know, has not been a member of the NATO military organization since the time of General de Gaulle and which does not have one foreign missile on its territory and makes do with its own nuclear missiles -- here we have it today, in effect occupying a position if not of obstruction then at least of very stubborn opposition, I would say, to what may happen in Europe as a result of the destruction even of just these two classes of nuclear missiles.

I think the next few days will bring further indications or information of some kind about the nature of the French position, because French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac will begin his visit to Moscow. He has made quite a few statements on the subject we are talking about, but I would like to draw attention to one he made 1 or 2 days ago: He said that since Peter the Great, the aim of the Russians has been to disarm Europe. At first I thought, how right he is, this is a very true observation. Just 270 years ago in May of 1717 Peter I, began in Paris the negotiations that ended in the signing of the treaty between Russia, France, and Prussia in August that same year, in Amsterdam. For various reasons that existed at the time, the monarchs did not succeed in forming a real alliance. But, France and Russia then declared quite definitely that they were entering into friendly relations and had undertaken to act jointly for the sake of achieving a general calm in Europe. Well, that is precisely what is called, in today's language, European security. But then I thought that there was more than met the eye in this historical excursus by the French prime minister.

After all, official Paris today gives the words European disarmament a completely different meaning. Every day, at all levels and in every key, they are saying in France that the Soviet Union now intends to disarm [obezoruzhit] Western Europe. You will detect the difference: Not to achieve disarmament throughout Europe [razoruzhit], but to disarm [obrezoruzhit] Western Europe -- strip it of its arms, render it defenseless, make it absolutely weak in the face of...

[Charikov, interrupting] In other words, gain military superiority.

[Tsoppi] Gain military superiority.

[Charikov] It is not our term.

[Tsoppi] That superiority -- they speak of superiority in conventional arms including armored divisions and so on -- can be offset only by nuclear weapons, in the opinion of the politicians in Paris. A false concept is being deliberately substituted for a real one, and that spurious substitution rehabilitates in advance, as it were, all actions directed against delivering the whole of Europe -- not just Western Europe and not just Eastern Europe -- from nuclear weapons; all actions directed against a general calm in Europe. Today these maneuvers form a contrast -- to put it mildly -- against the background of real and increasingly substantial positive changes in international politics, with the ideas of fighting for a nuclear-free Europe ceasing to be utopian, ceasing to be a matter of pious intentions, and beginning to take on the flesh and bones of reality.

This is indeed understood by very many people in Europe today. But Paris says no: No, we do not need that; we shall display double vigilence in regard to all the Soviet proposals. At a very high level -- I am thinking of French Foreign Affairs Minister Jean-Bernard Raimond -- they are saying how surprising it is that in the West, not only the public but also official circles believe that Gorbachev is blazing completely new trails. Here we can see their assumed skepticism, a skepticism that dictates their stance, for the French Government has already completely disavowed its support for the zero option, although it was its most ardent advocate when the United States put it forward. At that time, both the French president and the French Government supported that very zero option, but now that this zero has become attainable, has turned out to be within the realm of possibility, so to speak, for some reason it is no longer in line with the interests of France and universal peace.

The following formula is now dominant: We are for nuclear deterrence and for the U.S. nuclear presence on European soil. In my view, this stance is a fairly irresponsible one, and I do not think I am being overly harsh here. It is irresponsible because it is not a matter of French territory, but rather of that of other Western European countries, and to speak out so categorically for continuing, for intensifying, and for augmenting the nuclear threat to the whole of Europe today, in my view, ill becomes France, which has done so much for Europe's glory and grandeur, and which fought alongside the allies in World War II, in the war against Hitlerism.

In this connection, I would like to say a few words in general about our relations with France. When Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the French Communist Party, [PCF] met in Moscow on 4 May, it was not simply a conversation between like-minded comrades who had simply come together to confirm their stance. It was an exchange of views between the leaders of two parties acting in totally different historical conditions and tackling different tasks, an exchange of views that turned out to be very fruitful. The main conclusion from their dialogue is as follows:

The CPSU and the PCF feel that objective conditions exist in the world for creating a powerful and effective coalition of all peace-loving forces, which would be capable of creating a barrier to the nuclear threat and of ensuring mankind's survival.

Both parties are acting robustly in this area; our parties are in favor of continuing and developing Soviet-French dialogue, that is essential. It is all the more essential at a time when such considerable, profound, and acute differences are appearing on issues of war and peace, on issues of European security or -- to use a term from the time of Peter the Great -- on issues of general quiet in Europe. I would make an addition to this term: happy, tranquil, peaceful general quiet in Europe.

[Charikov] I would like to return to the following aspect of the problem of nuclear missile weaponry: What we are seeing is not only an unwillingness on the part of the U.S. Administration to find some kind of compromise on medium-range missiles, but in addition a striving to somehow guarantee itself -- let us say by illegal means -- superiority in strategic arms. We are perfectly well aware that since 1979, the SALT II treaty has been in existence. Though that treaty was never ratified by the U.S. Senate, there is, nevertheless, an accord on adherence to it.

Incidentally, since 1979, in the U.S. Congress -- both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, incidentally -- speeches have been made supporting adherence to that treaty because the Reagan administration, which came to power not long after the treaty was signed, showed an implacable and indomitable desire to somehow, if not formally abrogate that treaty, then at least overstep its threshold. From time to time, U.S. congressmen have expressed their interest in seeing the administration observe the treaty, in seeing the strategic arms framework and...well, limits remain unshakeable. So, in November of last year, as we recall, the U.S. Administration armed the Air Force with a B-52 bomber with cruise missiles on board, which was the first unit of strategic nuclear arms in excess of that limit. Since then, these violations have been continuing, and both Reagan and his closest colleagues have been stating for all to hear that they no longer consider themselves bound by that agreement.

I think this expresses in general a certain -- how can I put it -- improbity on the part of the U.S. Administration in its conduct of international affairs, an improbity that has been fairly perceptible in the past few years, and irresponsibility as well, alongside which...

[Charikov, interrupting] Immorality.

[Tsoppi] Yes, precisely, immmorality, alongside which they are constantly moralizing to all of mankind.

[Charikov] Yes. This now gives us the opportunity to move on to the subject of Irangate. But, all the same, I would like to dwell further on SALT II, particularly since there is something to be said here. The fact that the U.S. legislators are, I would say, consistently -- in one can put it that way and fairly seriously, to judge by the voting results, advocating adherence to the treaty and refusing the administration new funds for financing arms exceeding the framework of the SALT II treaty, if we take into account these persistent actions, then we can imagine just how strong the opposition is to this adventurism, this immorality, this improbity in U.S. foreign policy, in that of the current administration, I mean.

Now and again questions crop up -- often in letters -- as to whether the U.S. legislators have gained a certain political insight and whether they have reached a point at which things have become clear to them that were not clear before.

How does one answer this question? In my view, there is no straightforward answer. One can only say that certain kinds of processes of reinterpretation of political realities are indeed taking place in Washington. That is a fact. As to how fast they will take place, we cannot yet say, because the United States is a complex country and a very great deal depends on short-term considerations: the election campaign and everything else, perhaps even on flare-ups of local tension, etc. Nonetheless, one can note with certainty that this process has begun. In the present context, I do not want to use the words new political thinking in reference to U.S. Congressmen...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] Let us say slightly renewed.

[Charikov] I would not even say renewed, but rather a political thinking that takes into account the new realities. So, that is the expression I would use in answer to the question radio listeners ask us in their letters and that often crops us in the foreign press.

Now, respected colleagues, I would like to back the question of Irangate, which arose as we begun talking about the immorality of U.S. foreign policy. Indeed, Irangate is a far cry from Watergate, although the two events are comparable by their degree of resonance.

[Grigoryev] Yet, however, the latter was a more internal affair...

[Charikov interrupting] Absolutely right.

[Grigoryev] Or, in other words, simply an internal affair...

[Charikov interrupting] That is exactly the point.

[Grigoryev] While this one has spread very far beyond the U.S. borders.

[Tsoppi] Those were dirty tricks in their own kitchen whereas now it has all been brought into the international arena.

[Charikov] Two questions are usually asked: What was the aim of Irangate, or the Irangate operation, will call it as I see it, the purpose was, on the whole, twofold. First of all, to support the pro-U.S. forces in Iran by supplying these forces with arms; to extend for a longer period, if possible, the Iran-Iraq conflict, thus perpetuating and making permanent the explosive conflict in the Near East.

[Tsoppi, interrupts] ...And thus to take revenge for the defeat of the United States in Iran when the Shah's regime fell.

[Charikov] This is the first point. The second point is a purely commercial purpose: to use the proceeds from this, or even the profit from the proceeds, for financing the hired bandits they call by the Spanish word contras. Well, a good deal has been written in our press about Irangate and its history and a lot of foreign articles have been translated and published here, too. I hope, our listeners have an idea of what has been going on since last November, as I would like only to touch upon the present stage of this political scandal. Hearings on Irangate have opened in Congress, in special congressional committees; 26 congress members -- 11 Senators and 15 members of the House of Representatives -- are taking part in the hearings. They are to listen to more than 50 witnesses and to familiarize themselves with 10,000 pages of documents.

To what might Congress' investigation of Irangate lead? Could it be that Congress will force the administrative power in the person of the President and his entourage -- the National Security Council staff and those who have been linked to them -- to admit their guilt and to resign? Is that a possible outcome? Well, you know, I would not like to anticipate now and forecast the development of events; it just seems to me that this whole Irangate investigation pursues two ends: First of all, to show how democratic the American system itself ostensibly is. Consider that in the words of the Tower Commission, the administration committed an unseemly act, which it has admitted, on the whole. This is the first point. It is prepared to accept, I do not know, some sort of reprimand, perhaps, from its compatriots. This is the first goal, so to speak. Second, it seems to me, this investigation -- which will last for another 3 months -- aims to bring the entire case into such a maze, into such an impasse, and bury the traces, the true traces of this crime and international affairs, so deep as to forget about it for good.

[Grigoryev] Such cases...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] They act according to the principle: If you do not sin, you cannot repent. But, once you have repented you are free to indulge in sin again.

[Grigoryev] How many similar instances we have previously seen both in the United States and Western Europe! Think of the Glick affair in the FRG. What a hue and cry there was! The chancellor was summoned before a similar commission!

[Tsoppi] In France they are now quite unable to sort out the affair of that notorious Carrefours du Developpement in which former ministers and other functionaries are implicated.

[Grigoryev] That is it! The top people of the state, so to speak, give testimony and then all this amounts to nothing, slowly and peacefully.

[Tsoppi] You know, dear colleagues, I think that nevertheless when reading newspapers or listening to foreign radio, I think that there is one topic in today's world that dominates all others, which evokes unusual interest, attention, and a striving to understand in very many people in the world.

I mean the things that are taking place in our country: our restructuring, our restructuring of Soviet diplomacy, and our internal restructuring, which is destined to take our society and our country to heights that, not long ago we could not even have dreamed of. Books on this subject are already being brought out and articles are appearing every day in major serious Western newspapers and magazines in which people write who are very far removed from us but on whom all this is making simply an overwhelming impression.

I would like to quote a couple of words, with your permission, said by a man we all know about, the U.S. millionaire Armand Hammer, who, although he is a millionaire, has nevertheless been dealing with our economy and our country from the times of Lenin, and who knew Vladimir Ilich. So, Armand Hammer, who will soon be celebrating his 89th birthday -- on which we cordially congratulate him -- has put it like this: The words reconstruction [perestroyka] and openness [glasnost] are known to readers of editorials in the majority of U.S. newspapers, and these concepts should be evaluated unequivocally as a bold attempt by the new Soviet leadership to revive the economy and put in order the activities of a luxuriant bureaucracy.

The success of those initiatives will become one of the keys to future relations between two of our countries. And further: Gorbachev has certain obvious problems, but he is extremely pragmatic and combines this with a charisma that makes him a self-assured leader who is striving to raise the standard of living of the Russian people in the shortest possible time. Because of Russia's domestic needs, Gorbachev needs a period of peace and detente.

Certain Sovietologists insist that we should not trust him, but I, Hammer says, agree with Thatcher, who recently said after spending a few days in the Soviet Union: I trust Gorbachev's word. I think that, finally, the development of the world situation is going to depend to a very large degree on how things go in our own country, and on how boldly, how rapidly, resolutely, and radically we restructure our society.

[Grigoryev] Well, this is really so, yet it is all the more important for us to look more attentively at what is going on in our country and to evaluate it, while at the same time also evaluating attentively the response to it abroad. The response is indeed very broad and varied and, consequently, ambiguous. There are people who applaud us sincerely, and there are people who applaud, but not sincerely, because they are convinced that, we have at last come to our senses and decided to move toward the same bourgeois democracy that they have been trying to teach us.

[Tsoppi] This has simply scared many people.

[Grigoryev] Yes. There are people who are simply slandering us and are saying that nothing will come of what those Bolsheviks are doing. There are all kinds of reactions. There are even sincere doubts among our friends: Are we not deviating from socialism? One should not conceal that, either. They are genuine friends of our country, but maybe they are not aware enough of our reality and are trying to form general theoretical judgements on our socialism and on what we have achieved. It seems to me that in evaluating what we are doing in our country, and in evaluating foreign evaluations, we ourselves must remember a concise and very meaningful motto: More solution and more democracy. Here, it seems to me, lies the key to what we have done and what we have yet to do.

[Charikov] Well, comrades, our program's time is up. On behalf of its participants, I thank you for listening and bid farewell to you. Goodbye and all the best to you.

SCIENTISTS, DIPLOMATS DISCUSS NUCLEAR WAR

LD081658 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1056 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] Moscow, 8 May (TASS) -- The heads of diplomatic representations of foreign states accredited in the USSR have acquainted themselves with the activities of Soviet scientists on averting the threat of a nuclear war. Today they had a meeting with Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, chairman of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and other members of the committee.

It was emphasized that this public organization sets its objective contributing to the delivering of mankind from nuclear weapons. The diplomats were shown a documentary film of the scientists' struggle for peace.

The meeting was organized by the Protocol Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

WORK ON 'STEALTH' BOMBER SAID INTENSIFIED

LD101847 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 10 May 87

[From the "Vremya' newscast]

[Text] The U.S. militarist circles are continuing to intensify work on the construction of a new "Stealth" bomber for the USAF. This bomber is capable of being invisible to the opponent's radars and radar installations and at the same time of penetrating the densest anti-aircraft defense. [video shows NBC film of unidentified delta-wing aircraft];

As one of the participants in the development of the new invisible bomber said, the implementation of this new militarist project will cost an astronomical sum, $80 billion.

REAGAN RADIO ADDRESS FOCUSES ON ARMS BILLS

LD092020 Moscow TASS in English 2014 GMT 9 May 87

[Text] Washington May 9 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reporting:

The White House launched a new offensive on the Congress of the United States in a bid to prevent the supreme legislative body of the country from passing a series of amendments to bills providing for practical steps to limit nuclear arms.

In his regular radio address to the nation President Reagan expressed "grave concern" of the administration over the proposals on that problem currently discussed in Congress.

These are, above all, the amendments that ban nuclear explosions with yields over one kiloton and the testing of an anti-satellite system against a real target in space, and demand strict observance by the U.S. of the main provisions of SALT-2 with which the current administration demonstratively refused to comply.

President Reagan described those measures that enjoy a broad backing among the democratic majority in Congress as "irresponsible".

The President asserted that the amendments would "threaten our arms reduction negotiations with the Soviets" and "pull the rug out from under" the U.S. delegation to the talks.

However, it follows from the President's own explanations that the White House is primarily concerned over the impact of the amendments under discussion in Congress might have on the Pentagon's plans for building up U.S. military power, not over their possible effect on the process of arms control.

"Now the progress we've made in the last six years rebuilding our defenses is once again being put in jeopardy by the short-sightedness of some in Congress," Ronald Reagan said.

The President emphasized once again that if Congress approved the bill which in his words, "undermines the national defense" of the U.S. he would have no other choice but to veto it.

AUTHORITIES 'CONCEAL' NUCLEAR TEST ACCIDENT

LD090836 Moscow TASS in English 0734 GMT 9 May 87

[Text] San Francisco May 9 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yuriy Algunov reports:

The U.S. authorities applied maximum efforts in an attempt to conceal the circumstances of an accident that occurred during tests for military purposes at the nuclear Rainer Mesa test sites in Nevada on April 10, 1986.

Almost 13 months have passed before the U.S. Department of Energy, under whose authority one of the U.S. largest nuclear facilities is, has released a special report on what had happened and certified the fact of the radiation leak beyond the explosion zone.

It is clear from the document that safety hardware failed during the regular nuclear test code-named "Mighty Oak". Steel safety flaps failed to withstand the blast a minute after it was set off. As a result, underground communications system was severely contaminated with radiation. The shock wave and high temperature instantly put out of action the monitoring equipment installed in tunnels and denied the personnel of the test range an opportunity to control the situation.

Salvage teams could get down to work directly in the area of the accident only after a year. They found heavy damage, numerous obstructions and crooked equipment. During the opening of the underground silos and ventilation of the tunnels there occurred an escape of radiation into the atmosphere, which the Depatment of Energy hurried to call as non-hazardous.

The report on one of the most dramatic accident at the U.S. key nuclear test site, which is actively involved in the "Star Wars" programme, has been published. However, the true scope of the accident remained to be under tight wraps. It is highly probable that we will never learn the whole truth about what had happened, an official spokesman for the Department of Energy said.

SPOKESMAN 'UNPREPARED' TO DISCUSS BRAZINSKAS

LD091151 Moscow TASS in English 1004 GMT 9 May 87

[Text] Washington May 9 TASS -- Phyllis Oakley, spokeswoman for the U.S. Department of State, was unprepared to discuss the question of the extradition of criminals Brazinskas to the Soviet Union. At the latest briefing she was asked what measures the Department of State intends to take with regard to the criminals who hijacked a Soviet plane at gunpoint in 1970, killed an air hostess, wounded members of the crew and flew the plane to Turkey. Later the criminals moved to the USA. In an answer to the question of a TASS correspondent, Phyllis Oakley said that she was not prepared to comment on that case at that moment.

It is quite obvious that the Department of State whose officials are so eager to talk about "combatting terrorism" had more than enough time to examine the case of criminals Brazinskas. This question was raised more than once, but Washington remains silent about Brazinskas. Meanwhile the terrorists whose hands are stained with the blood of innocent people remain at large.

U.S. AIMS AT 'CURTAILING' JAPANESE-SOVIET TRADE

LD082210 Moscow TASS in English 2142 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 8 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Askold Biryukov writes:

An event which happened in the days of Japan's Prime Minister Nakasone's official visit to Washington showed where "solidarity with the West" or, more correctly, with the United States, solidarity which Tokyo constantly proclaim can lead Japan. At the bid of the CIA and under the Pentagon's pressure, the U.S. and Japanese authorities started harrassing a large Japanese machine-building company Toshiba Kikai. The company's central office and branches were raided and searched by the police. The head of the Japanese Government even hinted at the possibility of "administrative" sanctions against the company, which would deprive it of the license for the export of its goods over several months. The group of American congressmen drafted a bill which, if adopted, would bar Toshiba Kikai goods from the U.S. market.

What was the pretext for all the hullabaloo? The Japanese company which is conducting, just as numerous Western firms, usual commercial operations with the Soviet Union was accused of "illegally" exporting four machine-tools to the USSR several years ago "in violation" of restrictions of COCOM, the consultative group committee which exercises control over export to socialist countries. Experts admitted that those machine-tools wer not any special equipment. They were installed at the Moscow plant "Krasniy Proletariy" and are used for the manufacture of civilian products which Western delegations visiting the enterprise could ascertain.

But this is of no consequence to those who have long been annoyed with normal economic ties between states belonging to different social systems, to those who would like to replace mutually advantageous international trade with the law of the jungle when the strongest one would be dictating its will in the world market. And so they in Washington discovered another "Soviet menace" in the sale of four Japanese machine-tools to the USSR. Chief of the Pentagon Weinberger went almost into hysterics when addressing Japanese officials and finally threatened them with direct sanctions against Japan unless it starts curtailing its trading with the "empire of evil."

Washington's aim is easy to see. Clear also is the task that they in Washington set themselves of late in connection with the aggravation of commercial and economic relations in Tokyo. They are striving by every method, including such methods as are prohibited in the international community, to weaken their Far Eastern competitors in the world market of machinery, equipment and advanced technology. It is Tokyo's stand which gives food for thought. Is it ready, at the first bid of the "senior partner", to punish its own businessmen in order to please American business, to pacify the Washington protectionists? For the hounding of Toshiba Kikai complicates the positions of Japanese machine-bulding companies, difficult as it is.

The newspaper ASAHI has information that the volume of output in machine-building of Japan, and consequently profits of companies, will drop this year by 22 per cent, specifically because of "voluntary curbs" on exports to the USA introduced under the United States pressure. The newspaper notes tht in this connection Japanese companies pinned great hopes on the export to socialist countries.

And the stand of the Japanese Government means red light to those hopes. Strict application of COCOM rules which is clearly not in keeping with the spirit of the times can deprive Japan of many important markets for products of machine-building, TOKYO SHIMBUN newspaper noted.

The adversaries of Soviet-Japanese goodneighbourliness clearly strive to deal a blow at the starting tendency for the development of relations between the USSR and Japan. It is not accidental that, just as always in such cases, the stand of the Japanese authorities evoked a marked increase of the activity in the ultra-right circles which launched a campaign of blackmail and threats against those who act for the benefit of normalization and development of versatile relations with the Soviet Union.

U.S. PRESS CITED ON CIA LINKS WITH SAUDI ARABIA

LD111117 Moscow TASS in English 1050 GMT 11 May 87

[Text] Washington May 11 TASS -- Saudi Arabia acting with the agency of the U.S. CIA is secretly funding counter-revolutionary Afghan gangs. Through official channels alone Saudi Arabia has granted 1.5 billion dollars to Afghan counter-revolutionary chiefs, the newspaper WASHINGTON POST said today. A CIA station chief in the capital city of Riyadh was used as a go-between for the transfer of these funds. It has been also learnt that Afghan counter-revolutionary chief Abdul Rasul Siyah received ten million dollars from the Saudi ambassador in Pakistan. In addition, the newspaper has learnt that considerable sums are transferred to counter-revolutionaries by private Saudis.

THE WASHINGTON POST also pointed to the involvement of Saudi officials in the scandalous deal for the sale of U.S. arms to Iran and the diversion of a part of the funds to the Nicaraguan contras and Afghan counter-revolutionaries. The newspaper notes in that connection that former national security adviser Robert C. McFarlane discussed that question with Saudi Prince Bandar Ibn Sultan. THE WASHINGTON POST believes that a clear indication of Saudi Arabia's close association with the CIA on the issue of financing Afghan counter-revolutionary gangs is the fact that it is precisely pro-Saudi groups that were the first to receive U.S. anti-aircraft Stinger missiles. As is known the Stingers are supplied to the counter-revolutionaries only through the CIA's agency.

CIA 'MANIPULATES' CONGRESS FOR MUJAHIDIN FUNDING

LD081246 Moscow TASS in English 1224 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 8 TASS -- "By fabricating numerous disinformation concerning Afghanistan, the American USIA and the CIA apparently not so much mislead the world public as deceive their own people, the Senate and the Congress," Viktor Ponomarev, a TASS news analyst, writes in the just published issue of the popular Soviet weekly "NEDELYA" in an article dealing with U.S. growing and quite costly interference in the affairs of sovereign Democratic Republic of Afghanistan (DRA).

The news analyst recalls how at one time CIA resident agents in West European countries looked for recruits among Afghans who were there for the U.S. undeclared war against Afghanistan, and how, by using them, managed to 'knock out' lavish appropriations from Congress.

The CIA is busy carrying out the largest-scale undercover operation around Afghanistan since the war in Vietnam.

About 80 percent of all funds allocated for such operations in general is being spent on it. This is ten times as much as the United States spends on the secret war against Nicaragua.

The article says with reference to U.S. NEWSWEEK magazine that the undeclared war, which the White House intends to conduct aginst the DRA 'to the last Afghan,' has already cost the U.S. taxpayers 1,350 million dollars.

It turned out, though, that a considerable part of the astronomical sum was diverted. As is admitted by informed persons in U.S. Congress, more than 30 percent of the "aid" which was intended for the Afghan counter-revolutionaries was appropriated by the leaders of groups and "intermediaries" in Pakistan.

During the investigation of the notorious "Irangate," it turned out that part of the money assigned for the Afghan counter-revolutionaries wound up on the same account at the same Swiss bank as the funds intended for the Nicaraguan 'contras'.

In short, the machinations involving those funds went to such lengths that an investigator of the U.S general accounting office is said to have launched a formal inquiry on that score.

"Meanwhile," NEDELYA writes, "the White House carries on operations aimed at destabilising the legitimate government of Afghanistan and at 'stepping up military pressure for political purposes' and, as a result, to make the stay of the limited contingent of the Soviet troops in the DRA 'long, sanguinary, and expensive.'"

"The U.S. authorities' strategy as regards Afghanistan boils down to smuggling weapons and publicly demanding talks while blocking efforts to achieve a solution through talks."

"Naturally, all that requires much money. In order to make U.S. Congress allocate funds, attempts are being made to convince it of a 'high effectiveness' of the U.S. 'aid' to the counter-revolutionaries."

"The senators are being told, for example, that the counter-revolutionaries ostensibly shoot down 'one plane a day' by means of U.S.-supplied missiles."

"It does not occur to anyone to reckon up only to find out that the number of allegedly shot-down planes has long exceeded the number of missiles supplied from the USA to the counter-revolutionary groups."

"In other words, an intensive 'manipulation' of the U.S. Congress is being continued."

CIA FORMS 'NICARAGUAN RESISTANCE' GROUP

LD082137 Moscow TASS in English 2119 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 8 TASS -- Follows commentary by Nikolay Chigir, a TASS political news analyst:

"The policy of aiding the Nicaraguan contras pursued by the Reagan administration is suffering a fiasco, American Senator Christopher Dodd recently said commenting on the squabbling between various counter-revolutionary groups and the resignation of some of them from the leadership of those groups.

Indeed, the dislocation among the ranks of the contras in recent months, especially after the withdrawal from those organizations of such of their leaders as Arturo Cruz and Alfonso Robelo has become irreversible. There is no prospect for a military victory by the contras, the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR said.

Under this situation the Washington administration began feverishly drawing up measures to prevent a total collapse of its mercenary host, on which it places such high stakes in the foul game against sovereign Nicaragua. The U.S. CIA, which cobbled together and is zealously patronizing over the contra gangs from the very start of the undeclared war against Nicaragua, has been instructed to form a single anti-Nicaraguan bloc from among the contra groups which have disintegrated, as a matter of fact. To that aim an assemblage of counter-revolutionary rabble has been called in Miami. A new alliance of bandit groupings named "Nicaraguan resistance" has been announced at it. But whatever signboards may be used as a cover for the murderers, at whose hands thousands upon thousands of peaceful Nicaraguan citizens, including women, children and old people have fallen, one thing is obvious that this criminal rabble is the CIA's creation.

The contras and the CIA are birds of a feather, Tom Whicker, an observer of THE NEW YORK TIMES, wrote. The contras should have the word CIA tatooed on their foreheads.

The Somozistas, who stained themselves by bloody crimes both in the period of the pro-American dictatorship in Nicaragua and in the course of carrying out CIA's assignment for making short shift of the Nicaraguan revolution, as before, make the backbone of that bandit army. It is not accidental, as is reported from Miami, that it is planned to incorporate Adolfo Callero, a CIA agent zealously advocating a broadening of terrorist activities against the Nicaraguan people and their government, into the leadership of the "Nicaraguan resistance". It is apt to recall in that connection that once Washington thought of making Callero a successor to dictator Somoza.

The Washington administration, which is head over ears bogged down in "Irangate" is, as we see, advancing on the path of military adventurism and sordid machinations connected with the machinations which have played no minor role in touching off that major political row in the USA.

Washington's attempts at reorganizing its hired army of the contras is aimed above all at reorganizing its hired army of the contras is aimed above all at keeping hold of the cannon fodder used by it in the undeclared war against Nicaragua. At the same time, this manoeuvre, according to the Reagan administration's designs, is to break the growing resistance to a further appropriation of funds to military aid to the contras by the U.S. legislators, who ever more clearly realize that the U.S. Administration's aggressive policy in Central America bears no promise.

ZORIN COMMENTS ON 'IRANGATE' INVESTIGATION

LD091028 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1852 GMT 8 May 87

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valentin Zorin]

[Excerpts] For the 3d day running the U.S. Senate is conducting public hearings with regard to the Irangate-contra scandal. One after the other, witnesses under examination are giving their testimony in the Senate hall, describing the various circumstances of this scandal, which is perhaps the biggest in the entire political history of the United States.

On the day the Senate hearings opened, my IZVESTIYA colleagues speculated that these hearings will turn out to be nothing more than an ordinary television show for bored housewives, since everything that can be found out about the circumstances of their affair is already known. I shall permit myself to disagree with this conclusion, which seems to me to be too hasty and uncorroborated. I disagree for two reasons, at least. In the first place, there are absolutely no grounds for presuming that all and every detail, including important details, of this affair is already known, and that the Senate investigation currently under way will produce nothing new. In the second place, it is apposite to ask whether it is not too great a luxury for the United States to make serious relevations about the illegal actions of the Washington administration into a means of entertainment for bored housewives? If Americans are now daily being presented with a picture that, to put it mildly, does not contribute toward raising the authority of the powers that be, this is by no means in order to entertain anybody, nor because the organizers of such a show are free in their actions and acting according to their own will. It is perfectly obvious that behind the investigations of the scandal, which have already been going on for several months, as also behind the new turn in this affair, when the investigation is being shown on television -- that is, going out in tens of millions of copies -- there are extremely powerful forces in the United States today pursuing a goal far from entertainment. I shall talk later about what sort of forces these are, and what they are aiming at. [passage omitted]

When the present crisis flared up, the majority of experts, including our U.S. affairs experts, surmised that this time the matter would not go as far as impeachment of the President. The costs of such an outcome are too high for the U.S. state and statehood, especially if this comes about for the second time in a comparatively short period of time. Well, I personally still consider myself among those who presume that in spite of the new and important details of the scandals that are continually coming to light, the President currently in power will be allowed -- that is, given the opportunity -- to exercise this mandate to the end. At the same time, however, one should not forget this sort of thing has its own internal logic. Leon Jaworski, the special prosecutor who conducted the Watergate affair, did not think, to start with, about removing President Nixon, either. But then the initial scenario was broken up, and the affair took an unexpected turn for many people. [passage omitted]

In the United States, the fight has in fact already begun for who is to replace Ronald Reagan in the White House as a result of the elections next year. Attacks are being made on the current President now, not only by his political rivals from the Democratic Party, but also by influential Republican leaders, aiming to prevent Vice President Bush from following the current President: The Irangate revelations compromise Bush as well as Reagan.

The other serious circumstance behind the present Washington political crisis is the economic rivalry and political squabbling between the leading groups of U.S. monopolies. It has come about that just one mighty Californian group of bankers and entrepreneurs has gained predominant influence in the Reagan administration. Their competitors not infrequently feel themselves squeezed and cheated of their fair share. [passage omitted]

MOSCOW ON 'TRUE PURPOSE' OF JAPAN-S. KOREA TALKS

OW080819 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 7 May 87

[(Yurskiy) commentary]

[Text] Talks between Japan and South Korea in Seoul have ended. Radio Moscow commentator (Yurskiy) comments on these talks:

Peace and normalization of the situation on the Korean Peninsula was deliberately stressed at Japanese Foreign Minister Kuranari's meetings with South Korean Foreign Minister Choe Kwang-su and dictator Chon Tu-hwan. Foreign Minister Kuranari even advanced a 3-point plan aimed at stability on the Korean peninsula, appealing for a North-South dialogue.

However, political observers and mass media point out that the recent talks represent a new step toward consolidating a triangular strategic alliance among the United States, South Korea, and Japan. In addition, everyone knows that moves to form and consolidate this military alliance are the largest sources of tension in this region. Among these moves are Team Spirit -- a large annual U.S.-South Korean military exercise program in which Japan has been increasingly involved -- and deployment of U.S. tactical nuclear devices on the Korean Peninsula. The presence of the 7th Fleet equipped with Tomahawk nuclear cruise missiles also increases tension. Vessels from this fleet patrol waters between Japan and South Korea at all times and exchange port calls.

In this context, what was the real purpose of the recent talks between Japan and South Korea, which deliberately tried to play up their peaceful nature? YOMIURI SHIMBUN says that the high-pitched statement after the talks was probably designed to weaken the position of the antiestablishment force in South Korea and strengthen the footing of Chon Tu-hwan. This seems to be the true purpose of the talks.

In this regard, democratic forces are now carrying out an unprecedentedly fierce campaign against the dictatorial system in South Korea. Democratic forces -- rallying as many people from all social strata as possible around them -- are now opposed to the dictatorial system.

Washington appears to have great misgivings about the future of the triangular military alliance now being shaped in the Pacific. This is why Foreign Minister Kuranari flew to Seoul immediately after his return from the United States and held talks on principles governing the joint policy of the members of the triangular alliance regarding the Korean Peninsula.

This joint policy will seek to fully support the Seoul government and maintain the state of confrontation in this region. It is no accident that the participants in the talks ignored the DPRK's recent constructive proposal aimed at easing strains and improving the situation in this region. Included in this proposal were demands that the Korean peninsula be turned into a nuclear-free peace zone and that large-scale military exercises be halted, that is, such exercises be entirely stopped while negotiations are under way between the two states in Korea.

The participants in the Japan-South Korean talks also ignored various Soviet proposals for regional peace and security and a Soviet call for expediting Korea's democratic and peaceful reunification. Far from that, from beginning to end the talks indicated that the particpants were not totally considering Korea's peaceful reunficiation.

The inflated rhetoric used by the participants in the talks is designed only to deceptively overlook important points on the Korean issue, to attain South Korea's UN membership, and thereby to realize formal recognition of Chon Tu-hwan's unpopular regime, an important tool for aggressive U.S. strategies in Asia and the Pacific region.

SOVIET 'SOURCE' ON RECOGNITION OF N., S. KOREA

LD091126 Kuwait KUNA in English 0948 GMT 9 May 87

[Text] Tokyo, May 9 (KUNA) -- The Soviet Union would not accept reciprocal recognition by the two superpowers of South and North Koreas as suggested by Japanese Foreign Minister Tadachi Kuranari, according to Eastern bloc diplomatic sources here Saturday.

Kuranari declared in Seoul last Monday that officials in South Korea had welcomed his proposals calling on Moscow and Beijing to establish relations with South Korea in return for Washington and Tokyo's recognition of North Korea.

A Soviet source said that the chief diplomat's statement represents an increase in Japanese support to South Korea.

Another Soviet source said that reciprocal recognition would turn the partitioning of the Korean Peninsula into a permanent fact.

U.S.-S. KOREA CONSULTATIONS END IN WASHINGTON

LD091057 Moscow TASS in English 2159 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] Washington May 8 TASS -- Caspar Weinberger, head of the U.S. delegation to the 19th annual U.S.-South Korean consultations on security matters, said that the U.S. nuclear umbrella would continue providing additional security to South Korea. The consultations have ended in Washington.

On the whole, Weinberger's talks with South Korean Defence Minister Yi Ki-Paek proceeded according to an old scenario: referring to the "growing Soviet military potential" and "a threat from the North", the ministers announced their intention to continue keeping U.S. occupation forces in South Korea.

The participants in the consultations confirmed the plans for further modernization of the South Korean troops, including their equipment with modern F-16 fighters, as well as informed about their intentions to stage new big joint military exercises soon.

The U.S. attempt to subordinate the South Korean industry to the aims of the U.S. military industrial complex and load a considerable part of the growing joint military expenditure on South Korea was a distinctive feature of the recent consultations.

The Pentagon is primarily interested in the possibility to use the burgeoning South Korean electronics for military purposes.

Caspar Weinberger and Yi Ki-paek declared that South Korean defense industry was a vital resource of the free world and agreed to sign an agreement on broadening cooperation in the military production.

DPRK CALLS FOR NORTH-SOUTH ROLE IN OLYMPIC GAMES

PM080853 Moscow SOVETSKIY SPORT in Russian 8 May 87 p 4

["Statement by DPRK National Olympic Committee Spokesman"]

[Text] Pyongyang May 7 TASS -- The Olympic Committee of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea believes that holding the 1988 Olympic Games in both North and South Korea would promote peace and the relaxation of tensions on the Korean Peninsula and Korea's unification, enable all countries to take part in the games, and contribute to the cause of universal peace.

Chin Chung-kuk, deputy chairman of the DPRK Olympic Committee, read the statement at a news conference here today.

The statement rejected attempts by South Korea to dictate to the DPRK terms for hosting the games.

The DPRK Olympic Committee favored holding as soon as possible the fourth meeting of the leaders of the International Olympic Committee and the North and South Korea Olympic Committees in Lausanne to consider hosting the games in both parts of the peninsula.

The committee would exert every effort to speed up preparations for the games, the statement said.

IRAN CONTINUES 'UNFRIENDLY' STATEMENTS ON USSR

LD081649 Moscow TASS in English 1533 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] New York May 8 TASS -- The disgusting hidden motives behind "Irangate", which are being exposed now in the course of the inquiry, are most convincing evidence of who, in real fact, has a stake in the continuation of the senseless bloodshed between Iran and Iraq, whose victims have already been nearly a million people. The world public also knows who advocates the continuation of that fratricidal conflict. Addressing the Iranian Majlis today, Iran's president Seyyed 'Ali Khamene'i again reiterated the call for a war until ultimate victory. The war will continue until the Baghdad regime collapses, he said.

Apparently trying to divert public attention from the real causes behind the outstanding conflict, Iranian officials continue making statements unfriendly to the USSR and making sordid attempts at presenting in wrong light the USSR's policy vis-a-vis Iran and the Iran-Iraq war.

Characteristically, the most zealous efforts are made in that respect by those who are directly involved in secret talks with the U.S. Administration, which touched off the Irangate scandal. These people using the "Muslim revolution" slogans as a cover apparently knew too well that the money paid by them for the U.S. weapons is diverted to finance the supplies to the Nicaraguan contras -- the CIA agents, who set out to drown the Sandinist revolution in blood.

COMMENTARY ON IRAN'S TREATMENT OF AFGHAN REFUGEES

LD091144 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1630 GMT 8 May 87

[Commentary by TASS commentator Mikhail Vyatkin]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 8 Mar (TASS) -- [Passage omitted] Taking an inflexible position in the conflict with Iraq, official Tehran is wrecking all attempts to settle the disputes between the two countries peacefully at the negotiating table. This stubbornness has already cost Iran hundreds of thousands of young lives, and now Afghans who had the misfortune of ending up in Iranian territory for various reasons have been dragged into this senseless carnage.

The obstacles that Afghans face in that foreign land are to the advantage of the Iranian leadership, which uses them to replenish units that have perished at the front. It is partly for this reason that Tehran is using all possible means to try to prevent a settlement of the situation concerning Afghanistan. It has refused constructive negotiations with the Afghan leadership and is arming and training armed bands who are sowing death and destruction on Afghan soil. And, finally, Iranian authorities are hindering the return of those Afghans who want to return to peaceful labor in their own land. [passage omitted]

On the other hand, Afghan criminals who, under the guise of "fighters for the victory of Islam," are engaged in smuggling drugs, currency, and weapons, find every kind of support in Iran. In spite of the fact that these bands -- as reports by local authorites finding their way into the Tehran papers admit -- are quite simply terrorizing the population of the eastern provinces of Iran, Tehran is relying on the counterrevolutionaries. With their help, a large number of simple Afghans are being held in camps as hostages.

It is paradoxical but it is a fact, the Iranian leadership, which claims that it headed the anti-Shah revolution, is in this case in the same trench as the most reactionary and black force -- the Afghan counterrevolutionaries. Only imperialism can derive advantage from such a course.

DRA'S WAKIL HOLDS NEWS CONFERENCE ON RECONCILIATION

LD081529 Moscow TASS in English 1404 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] Kabul May 8 TASS -- Afghan Foreign Minister Abdol Wakil, who is a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, said here today that the national reconciliation policy proclaimed by the party and the government was supported by broad popular masses in this country.

He was speaking at a news conference for foreign correspondents who have arrived in Kabul from Moscow.

Wakil said that by this time 160 national reconciliation commissions had been set up in the country, more than 21,000 members of opposition groups had voluntarily laid down arms, and talks on a ceasefire were under way with 1,000 bandit groups.

The progress made at Afghan-Pakistani talks in Geneva, the Afghan foreign minister said, offered grounds for hoping for a comprehensive peace and security in Afghanistan and a peaceful political settlement of the situation concerning this country.

But imperialist and reactionary forces, including the United States, Pakistan, Iran and a number of other countries, were putting spokes in the wheel of national reconcilation in Afghanistan, Wakil added.

He said the United States had been supplying Afghan counter-revolutionary extremists with newest weapons, including Stinger missiles.

Last year U.S.-made missiles were used to down two Afghan aircraft. This year a Stinger missile shot down a transport plane with 40 passengers in the Khost area.

The Soviet limited military contingent invited by the lawful Government of Afghanistan to help repulse outside aggression, Wakil said, would, in accordance with an understanding reached between the USSR and this country, remain here until outside intervention discontinued completely.

The Afghan foreign minister went on to say that six Soviet regiments had already returned home but Afghanistan could not ask the USSR to return its limited military contingent home now that Pakistan was staging one provocation after another on the border with this country. The United States was stepping up shipments of armaments to Afghan anti-government forces, and peaceful aircraft were shot out of the sky in Afghan air space by Pakistani Air Force planes.

FRG'S WEIZSAECKER TO PAY OFFICIAL VISIT 6-11 JUNE

LD110604 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0548 GMT 11 May 87

[Text] Moscow, 11 May (TASS) -- Richard von Weizsaecker, federal president of the Federal Republic of Germany will pay an official visit to the Soviet Union between 6 and 11 June 1987 at the invitation of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

TURKISH GENERAL STAFF OFFICIAL WELCOMED IN MOSCOW

PM081523 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 May 87 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Moscow Arrival"]

[Text] Army General N. Torumtay [as published], first deputy chief of the Turkish Armed Forces General Staff, arrived in the Soviet Union on 6 May for an official visit at the invitation of Colonel General V.N. Lobov, first deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff.

The guest was met at the capital's Sheremetyevo Airport by Colonel General V.N. Lobov and other generals, admirals, and officers of the USSR Armed Forces.

Oktay Cankardes, Turkish ambassador to the USSR, was among the welcoming party.

PRE-VISIT COVERAGE OF CHIRAC VISIT TO MOSCOW

Kamentsev Discusses Visit

LD081320 Moscow TASS in English 1310 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 8 TASS — Vladimir Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received Yves Pagniez, the French Ambassador to the Soviet Union, here today.

They discussed questions concerning the forthcoming visit of the French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac to the Soviet Union.

Chirac Interviewed

LD091811 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 9 May 87

[Text] Paris May 9 TASS -- PRAVDA correspondent Vladimir Bolshakov and TASS correspondent Yuriy Lopatin reporting:

In the run-up to his visit to the Soviet Union Prime Minister Jacques Chirac of France received accredited Soviet journalists in the Matignon Palace, his residence.

The meeting was unofficial and we, therefore, cannot quote the French prime minister directly. But with his permission we will share our impressions of the meeting with our readers.

Jacques Chirac will pay an official visit to our country after a long interval. What does he expect from his meeting with the Soviet leaders?

Judging from his words, the Matignon Palace is watching the changes taking place in the U.S.S.R. with big interest.

It is believed here that the policies -- both foreign and domestic -- pursued by the new Soviet leadership create new possibilities for the East-West dialogue.

In the opinion of the prime minister, France can continue playing a positive role not only in the development of Soviet-French ties, but also in relations between the West and the socialist countries on the whole. It would seem that there is every possibility for that. On a number of matters the U.S.S.R. and France have a no small number of points of contact. For instance, the head of the French Government believes that the Helsinki process that has already given Europe many positive developments should be continued.

Jacques Chirac came out in favor of the expansion of all-round exchanges between the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

He also attached much importance to the development of Soviet-French trade.

And although, from his point of view, there now exists a disbalance in that area which is not in France's favor -- let us note in passing that this happened through no fault of the Soviet Union -- Chirac advocates in principle economic cooperation between our countries, because he believes that it promotes greater mutual trust and security.

Jacques Chirac spoke with enthusiasm about Soviet-French cultural ties. He had been personally interested in our culture -- and for a long time now.

In his youth he studied the Russian language and even translated Pushkin's Eugene Onegin into French.

The positions of the U.S.S.R. and France on certain regional problems are close, too.

For instance, the government headed by Jacques Chirac stands in favor, although with reservations, of the convocation of an international conference for the Middle East, and in favour of an international conference for the Middle East, and in favor of an early termination of the war between Iran and Iraq.

He expresses concern over the growing debt of the developing countries and the enormous scope of poverty, diseases and hunger there.

The prime minister believes it is important to find as soon as possible the means for giving more efficient assistance to those countries.

And there exists such a possibility indeed. It has been for long proposed by the developing countries themselves, by the "Delhi Six" and by the Nonaligned Movement.

The socialist countries put forward a whole complex of concrete proposals taking account of the wishes of those countries.

First of all, the proposals for an immediate termination of the arms race, the elimination of the weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, before the end of the current century.

During the conversation with us Jacques Chirac admitted that the funds currently spent on armaments could be channelled with great use into relieving the plight of the developing countries.

Alas, this was only a good intention expressed aloud.

As to concrete positions of France on disarmament issues, in recent times they have come to differ substantially from the approach of the U.S.S.R. and those of a number of Western European countries, too.

Of course, one can only welcome that France — and the prime minister reaffirmed it during the conversation with us -- stands in favor of the observance of the Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty in full against the militarization of outer space and that it has no intention of developing a French version of the SDI.

With certain reservations France does not object to the conclusion of a Soviet-U.S. agreement on the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe. But when these "reservations" are expressed it turns out that neither such an agreement nor prospects for the elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe and the world over suit France — although the government of Jacques Chirac says that such an agreement does not concern their country.

On the issue of the elimination of shorter-range missiles in Europe the stand of Paris is negative.

Speaking of some fatal predisposition of people to the settlement of their conflicts by means of war the French prime minister gives nuclear weapons the role of a certain guardian of the law and order in the world, even something of a guarantor of peace and security on this planet.

The prime minister reaffirmed that France intended to put that stake on "nuclear deterrence" in the future as well, that it had no desire to renounce either the modernization or the buildup of its nuclear arsenal and that it was getting ready for chemical weapons production.

The prime minister did not reply to the question why France needed that precisely at the moment when the Soviet Union and the U.S. were very close to an agreement on the elimination of their medium-range missiles in Europe, when the U.S.S.R. had stopped the production of chemical weapons and had embarked on their elimination.

The prime minister also did not respond to our question as to why many observers were lately getting the impression that with the coming of his government to power France and the United States switched places, as it were, in the approach to disarmament problems, especially in Europe.

One can hardly take seriously the prime minister's explanation of the reasons for an upsurge in the anti-Soviet campaign in France in recent time.

In his words, historically anti-Sovietism in France is a kind of reaction of anti-communist-minded quarters, which are represented in his government by the way, to the existence of a strong Communist Party in the country.

But if one follows this kind of "logic" it turns out that it is the French Communist Party that is responsible for anti-Sovietism being marked up in France and not those who are trying to poison Soviet-French relations by means of an anti-communist hysteria and spy mania campaigns and at the same time to deal a blow at the French Communist Party and other progressive organizations advocating friendship with the socialist countries, opposing the arms race and the onslaught of reactionary forces on the rights of the working people.

The fact that these quarters are working up anti-Sovietism in France is confirmed by the fabricated "Ariane case" because of which Soviet citizen L.P. Varigina (Verdier) is held under police watch without any grounds and proofs and is prohibited from leaving France for the Soviet Union where she is to take graduation exams at her institute. This is also confirmed by an anti-Soviet outcry started in the French right-wing press around that "case".

Alas, the prime minister refused to tell us anything reassuring about Ludmila's fate and said that the judicial organs, just like the "free" French press, were not under the government control.

Well, this is a more or less standard argument. However, it does not prevent not only French, but also other Western leaders from demanding that the Soviet Union "immediately release" those persons who were tried and sentenced in keeping with the Soviet laws, but whose fate for some or other reasons left Western advocates of human rights extremely concerned.

In conclusion Jacques Chirac came out in favor of an improvement of Soviet-French relations and their allround development.

He is confident that the USSR and France can do much together for strengthening peace in the world.

The Soviet Union is prepared for that. Long-standing traditions of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union amd France are valued in our country. We remember the contribution made to their development by President Charles de Gaulle.

One would like to hope that Jacques Chirac's party which proclaims itself a political heir to De Gaulle will reciprocate our intentions.

The visit of the French prime minister to the USSR creates every possibility for that.

BRIEFS

SOVIET-FINNISH COMPUTERS — Moscow 7 May, (TASS) — An agreement that has been concluded on the joint production of "Korvet" school computers marks a new stage in the development of Soviet-Finnish scientific-technical and production cooperation in the area of electronic engineering, Soviet experts believe. The Soviet Union is taking on the creation of microprocesors, while the Finnish side will engage in the production of the keyboard and the interior of the computer, which will be marketed in both cuntries. In a conversation with a TASS correspondent, Vladimir Maksimov, chief of a department at the USSR Ministry of the Radio Industry, noted that Finland is the only country in the West with which mutually beneficial parity in electronics coproduction has been achieved by this year. "In most of the equipment being produced jointly, half of the work is put in by the Soviet enterprises and the other half by the Finnish firms," he said. [Excerpt] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1050 GMT 7 May 87 LD]

SOVIET SHIP ATTACKED IN PERSIAN GULF 6 MAY

LD081401 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1340 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] Moscow, 8 May (TASS) -- As has been reported in Soviet competent circles, at 1230 Moscow time on 6 May the Soviet dry-cargo ship Ivan Koroteyev, which was sailing from Novorrossiysk to the port of Dammam in Saudi Arabia with a cargo of building materials and drainage pipes, was subjected to intensive fire from rockets and heavy caliber machineguns in the Persian Gulf. Unmarked launches carried out the shooting.

The vessel was seriously damaged. Fortunately none of the crew was injured.

Soviet competent bodies are carefully examining the circumstances of this piratical raid on a Soviet civilian vessel.

New York, 8 May (TASS) -- The ASSOCIATED PRESS agency reports that the attack on the Soviet vessel Ivan Koroteyev was carried out by Iranian launches.

Further Report

LD091345 Kuwait KUNA in Arabic 1000 GMT 9 May 87

[Text] Kuwait, 9 May (KUNA) -- A Soviet freighter has been attacked in the Arab Gulf in the first such incident affecting a Soviet ship since the beginning of the Iraq-Iran war. TASS reports that the freighter Ivan Koroteyev was sailing with a cargo of building materials and drain pipes toward the Saudi port of Dammam when it was attacked and damaged by launches. Meanwhile, the United States has pledged, in the words of President Reagan, to support any initiative designed to take adequate measures against any party involved in the Iraq-Iran war that refuses to cooperate with UN efforts to end the conflict.

U.S. news agencies have quoted maritime sources in the Gulf as saying an Iranian launch attacked the Soviet freighter on Wednesday as it was sailing off the coast of Dubai. TASS said heavy rocket and machinegun fire from the unmarked launches did serious damage to the vessel, but that no members of the crew were hurt. The Soviet news agency cited maritime sources as saying the ship was struck by Iranian launches. The Soviet authorities are investigating the circumstances surrounding the incident.

The attack on the Soviet freighter came only hours after Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov criticized what he called the attempts being made in Iran to complicate Soviet-Iranian relations. He accused certain Iranian officials and the Iranian media of making unfriendly statements about the Soviet Union, of trying to distort Soviet policy toward Iran and the Iraq-Iran war, and of misrepresenting relations between the two countries.

The Soviet officials who visited the Arab Gulf region recently warned that Moscow would give a firm reply to any attack on its ships.

Observers believe this attack on the Soviet ship has increased tension in the region. It is not known if the freighter Koroteyev was escorted by Soviet warships when it was attacked. However, according to shipping sources, Soviet warships usually accompany Soviet vessels bound for Iraq.

The Western states and the Soviet Union have announced they will protect freedom of navigation in the Gulf. U.S. Presidential envoy Richard Murphy, who is currently visiting the Arab Gulf region, will discuss the question of navigation in light of his country's pledge, as announced by President Reagan on 25 February. On that occasion, the President stressed the U.S. commitment to guarantee the free flow of oil through the Strait of Hormuz. President Reagan has also called for an end to the war and has asked Secretary of State Shultz to redouble his efforts to reach a negotiated settlement.

No one can deny the importance the stability of this region has for international relations, as it is an area with waterways and a strategic wealth from which various countries of the world benefit. The repercussions of tension in this region, with their harmful effects on its states and the states of the world, fall primarily on the continuation of the Iraq-Iran war, which the international community has been demanding an end to since it started some 7 years ago. The stand calling for an end to this war is an honorable way to both sides. The preservation of their rights in accordance with international laws and norms is a stand shared by the Soviet Union and the United States, and the other powers.

The Arab League is also endeavoring to end this war through negotiations. The Arab stand enjoys full international support, whether at the United Nations level, the UN Security Council, the Nonaligned Movement, or the Islamic Conference Organization. During his meeting in Washington yesterday with the seven-member Arab Committee stemming from the Arab League Council, President Reagan pledged to support the idea of imposing adequate measures on any side involved in the Iraq-Iran war who refuses to cooperate with UN efforts aimed at ending the war. President Reagan also reiterated the U.S. pledge to defend the Gulf region and guarantee the free passage of oil tankers in the Strait of Hormuz. He also supported the Arab League's efforts to find a settlement to the war through negotiations.

The attack on the Soviet freighter and the subsequent dangers resulting from such acts, in addition to concern shown by various states with regard to security and peace in this region, requires the undertaking of effective international measures by the UN Security Council to end this war, because of the dangers it containers in itself, the additional dangers against peace in the world, and against international relations in general.

Ending this war is the only way to preserve security and peace and to save this region from the burden of more victims and catastrophes. Any dangerous consequences could be avoided by responding to international resolutions calling for an immediate end to the war, and by sitting at a table of negotiations to solve the conflict between the two warring countries, in accordance with the international laws and norms.

IRAN'S REJECTION OF CEASE-FIRE PROPOSAL NOTED

NC091339 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 8 May 87

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Tehran has rejected Iraq's proposal for a cease-fire to prevent the bloodshed of Muslims during the holy month of Ramadan. Tehran has preferred war to a temporary cease-fire, even at the price of trampling on religious duties. This stand has caused aversion among many Muslims because it is contrary to their religious beliefs and does not conform with the teachings of the Koran, one verse of which says: Wage a jihad in the name of God against those who rise in hostility against you, but do not be an oppressor, because God does not love oppressors.

Every Muslim knows that this verse refers to wars that are waged to defend independence and national sovereignty vis-a-vis outside attacks and for liberation from oppression. Such wars are just and conform to Islam's peace-loving nature. However, what does the Iran-Iraq war have in common with these wars? It is about 5 years now that the war between the two countries has been going on along their borders. Although in the first stages of this conflict the Iranian people considered the liberation of their homeland their duty, this issue was forgotten a long time ago. Moreover, the hostile side was able to learn a lesson from its mistakes. It overcame ordinary suspicions and heeded the call for peace by millions of Muslims. It has been a long time since Baghdad has proposed to Tehran a cease-fire, an exchange of POW's, and the withdrawal of troops to behind international borders. Rejecting these proposals and doubting their sincerity do not conform with the spirit of the holy Koran's teachings, which state that if the enemy wants to make peace, one should make peace. Other verses consider it a great sin to play with the sentiments of the believers for purposes of war, so much so that one verse says that a person who expresses a wish for peace should not be considered an infidel.

Meanwhile, those who want to continue the Iran-Iraq war continuously speak of the need to punish the infidels and of unfurling the banner of Islam in Iraq and other countries. According to democratic Iranian press, it is very clear that the issue is no longer one of defense against the aggressor. On the contrary, the issue is one of intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries. A bloody war is being waged under the label of holy precepts. Tomorrow, Afghanistan or even Turkey may be attacked on the basis of nonsensical pretexts such as a threat against traditional Islamic dress. Therefore, the jihad will continue in order to wipe out sedition from the entire world.

The bloody wars in the holy month of Ramadan give rise to concern. Not one day passes without the Islamic Republic's trumpeting reports on the bloody war by the combatants of Islam and on the blows dealt the weak army of the enemy, as well as on the killing, wounding, or capture of tens and hundreds of Iraqi adolescents. When hearing these reports, many Iranian think of the thousands of Iranian adolescents who are falling like autumn leaves on the battlefields. The living too are expected to take up light arms and to attack the enemy's strong positions.

SAUDI ARABIA ORDERS ARREST OF KHASHUQJI

LD082126 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 7 May 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] King Fahd of Saudi Arabia has issued an order for the arrest of the Saudi billionaire 'Adnan Khashuqji, who is not currently in the country, if he attempts to enter the kingdom. This decision has been made because of data concerning Khashuqji's involvement in the secret delivery of U.S. arms to Iran via Israel. The exposure of the secret deal has set off a storm of indignation in the Arab world over the duplicitous policy of the U.S. Administration, which is striving by any means to drag out the bloody conflict between Iran and Iraq.

POLITBURO DISCUSSES DOMESTIC, INTERNATIONAL ISSUES

LD081927 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 8 May 87

[Text] At its latest session, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo discussed the question of letters from working people, measures to carry out and practically implement the proposals contained in the letters according to the decisions of the 27th congress and CPSU Central Committee January 1987 Plenum. It was noted with satisfaction that in their letters, the communists and non-party members unanimously support the party's course toward restructuring all areas of public life, improving economic relations, and developing democracy, openness, criticism, and self-criticism. Many letters express considerations on theoretical and practical questions of restructuring, cite positive examples of work in the new conditions, and make specific suggestions for improvement. At the same time, there are letters that report existing shortcomings and instances of infringement of discipline and order, suppression of criticism, and opposition to the current reforms.

The CPSU Central Committee greatly appreciates the working people's support of the party's course toward restructuring, and regards their high level of political and labor activity as a most important guarantee of the irreversibility of the changes being implemented, and of the all-round progress of Soviet society.

The departments of the CPSU Central Committee, the ministries and departments, the local party, and soviet and economic bodies are instructed to pay greater attention to the practical implementation of the working people's suggestions, and are alerted to the need to make full use of these suggestions in the process of preparing for the forthcoming CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The Politburo examined progress in carrying out the integrated program to develop consumer goods production and the service industries in the period 1986-2000. It was noted that in certain areas of activity, the tasks of this program, and the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee and of the USSR Council of Ministers associated with its implementation are not being satisfactorily fulfilled. Party and State organs are asked to take measures to overcome the lag that has been allowed to occur. The heads of ministries that have failed to meet their quotas for the production of consumer goods are warned of their personal responsibility for ensuring the planned levels of output of such goods. The attention of collegiums and party committees of ministries is drawn to the need to enhance the responsibility of cadres for a radical improvement of the quality and range of goods, speeding up their rate of renewal, and for increasing production of articles made to world standards. It is recommended that the development of paid services at enterprises of all industries should be accelerated, irrespective of their main activities, with special attention being devoted to services in the repair and construction of housing, the technical servicing of motor vehicles, tourism and excursions, physical culture and sport.

It was also proposed that individual labor activity by the population and the setting up of cooperatives for the production of consumer goods and in the services sphere should be speeded up. On the basis of the new economic mechanism, the task has been set to restructure the work of the retail trade organizations, intensify their influence on industry for purposes of increasing output and improving the range and quality of goods manufactured, and make fuller use of available reserves for the fulfillment of the plan for retail trade turnover and to substantially improve the organization of public catering.

Attention was drawn to raising the role and responsibility of local party and local soviet bodies for ensuring supplies of goods and services for the population and for keeping cash incomes and expenditure in balance. The need for the plants to provide for priority development of the production of goods and of the services sphere, and for ensuring fulfillment of the targets of the 12th 5-Year Plan period, the integrated program and the decisions of the party and government which are linked with it, were pointed out.

The question of making further improvements to work with young people in connection with the results of the 20th Komsomol Congress was examined at the session. The Politburo highly valued the congress as a great political event, not just for the Komsomol but for Soviet society as a whole. The congress demonstrated convincingly the complete support by young men and women for the course of the CPSU toward accelerating the country's social and economic development; the burning desire of the young generation to more actively join in the common work on restructuring; and its willingness, based on socialist democracy, to participate in specific ways in improving public life.

It was noted with satisfaction that the Komsomol has once again shown profound devotion to the ideals of the party and has confirmed its lofty purpose of being its closest aide and reliable reserve. The attention of party and Komsomol organizations was drawn to the need for raising further the Komsomol's contribution to the struggle for the revolutionary renewal of all sides of our life, to the fundamental restructuring of the economy, to scientific and technical progress, and to the development in young people of the ability to perceive and assess social manifestations from class, Marxist-Leninist positions.

It was pointed out that all party, local soviet, state and public organizations must place issues concerning the labor, ideological and political, moral, military-patriotic and international education of young people in the circle of their immediate and everyday concerns.

The state of work in developing direct links between enterprises and associations, and the setting up of joint enterprises and international associations and organizations between the Soviet Union and CEMA member countries was examined by means of monitoring decisions adopted earlier.

It was pointed out that the introduction of new forms of interaction is very important for expanding the scope and enhancing the dynamic nature of economic and scientific and technical cooperation between the states of the socialist community through the development of specialization and cooperation of production by all possible means.

Measures were outlined to speed up work on checking the mechanism of cooperation in the context of new integrational forms, primarily with regard to planning, price-setting, and material and technical supply. Stress was laid on the importance of training and of raising the qualifications of specialist cadres, and of reinforcing party influence in raising the effectiveness of foreign economic activity.

The Politburo approved the results of the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and French Communist Party [PCF] Secretary General Marchais. The meeting was an important stage in the development of cooperation between the CPSU and the PCF, and an expression of the new approach by both parties in the struggle for peace, democracy, and socialism.

Attention was drawn to the common interest of the CPSU and the PCF in developing cooperation between the USSR and France as an important link in European and world policy. Despite all obstacles, Soviet and French Communists will continue to advocate normal, mutually beneficial relations between the two countries, and to promote mutual understanding and friendship between the Soviet and French peoples.

The Politburo approved the results of the negotiations and talks Comrades Gorbachev and Shevardnadze conducted with Sepulveda, Mexico's secretary of foreign relations, which strengthened mutual understanding with this major country in the Western hemisphere in issues relating to international security, disarmament, and development, and to settling dangerous hotbeds of tension. The meetings also brought to light fresh opportunities for mutually-beneficial and manifold bilateral cooperation.

A number of other matters concerning domestic and foreign policy were reviewed at the CPSU Central Committee Politburo session.

PRAVDA REPORTS EXAMINE RECENT CPSU DECISIONS

'Labor, Social Discipline'

PM080929 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 87 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee has examined the question "On the Movement for a Collective Guarantee of Labor and Social Discipline." The resolution adopted notes that the movement "The Collective's Guarantee of Labor and Social Discipline" is increasingly gaining ground in various sectors of the country's national economy. In industry and construction some 15 percent of the teams comprising some 8 million workers are taking part in this movement.

The movement is the product of the creativity of the working people. At the F.A. Merkulov Severskiy pipe plant in Sverdlovsk Oblast teams have been adopting pledges on collective moral and material responsibility for the state of labor and social discipline for the past 18 years. In the absence of any kind of violations of discipline in collectives, various forms of material and moral incentives are applied, such as for instance increased rewards for the results of the year's work. In the event of the violation of production or social discipline by individual workers, collectives of teams, with the voluntary agreement of all their members, forgo part of their material benefits. Since the teams have been applying the principle of collective responsibility, losses of working time have been reduced at the plant by a factor of seven, absenteeism by a factor of eight, violations of public order have been halved, and cadre turnover has been cut by 30 percent.

Sverdlovsk Oblast party, soviet, and economic organs have promptly assessed the sociopolitical and national economic importance of this workers' initiative and have given it effective support. The teams' initiative was backed up with specific measures to improve production technology and organization and working and living conditions and has met with widespread support. More than 1,500 of the oblast's enterprises and organizations, or 24,000 teams comprising more than 300,000 workers, are currently involved in the movement. In the teams taking part in the movement losses of working time through absenteeism are 3-5 times less than in other collectives.

In an effort to improve the forms and to enrich the content of the movement, many teams are adopting collective responsibility for strict observance of labor and technological discipline, a high quality of output and of all work, rational utilization of machinery and equipment, and the firm establishment of a sober way of life.

The thrust and nature of this movement are in line with the directives of the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum, the 27th CPSU Congress, and the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum aimed at the restructuring of the economic mechanism, the effective utilization of all forms of direct democracy in production, the working people's greater direct participation in management, and the all-around development of their initiative and creativity in the implementation of tasks in the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic progress.

The CPSU Central Committee attaches great significance to the fact that the movement for a collective guarantee of discipline is gaining increasingly vigorous support among the working people and that the movement itself serves as a concrete experience of production self-management, strengthening collectivist relations and the moral education of the individual, and social control over the measure of labor and consumption. Measures of a collective nature exert an effective influence on violators of labor and social discipline. The application of the collective guarantee has also produced positive results at enterprises and production associations in the Tatar ASSR, Krasnoyarsk Kray, and Kaluga, Kuybyshev, and Chelyabinsk Oblasts. The movement has received a big boost due to the measures adopted by the party to strengthen discipline and order and firmly establish a sober way of life.

At the same time, party and trade union organizations and economic managers in some places have underestimated the importance of this movement and remain on the sidelines. A formalistic approach, hastiness, and administration by injunction are tolerated in the organization of this work. Pledges adopted by collectives are not always backed up by organizational, economic, and ideological-educational measures.

The CPSU Central Committee has approved the initiative of leading teams and the work of the Sverdlovsk Oblast party organization in developing the movement for a collective guarantee of labor and social discipline.

The CPSU Central Committee has advised union republic communist party central committees, party kraykoms, obkoms, and raykoms, primary party, trade union, and Komsomol organizations, and soviet and economic organs to carry out the necessary organizational and political education work to develop this movement, following the example of leading collectives and drawing on their experience, with a view to reinforcing labor and social discipline and stepping up the struggle for the strict observance of production technology and improved quality of output and all work. In the development of the movement for a collective guarantee, care must be taken to avoid administration by injunction and violation of the voluntary principle. It is recommended that this work be carried out in close connection with measures to introduce complete economic accountability, self-financing, team (collective) forms of labor organization and remuneration, to develop democracy in management, and to achieve high end results in production and economic activity.

The AUCCTU, trade union central committees and local councils, ministries and departments, union republic Councils of Ministers, soviet, trade union, and Komsomol organs, and leaders of enterprises and organizations are instructed to ensure that the production teams' initiative for a collective guarantee of labor and social discipline is widely studied and disseminated in labor collectives in all sectors of the national economy. [paragraph continues]

They are to pay special attention to the comprehensive generalization of the movement's local leading experience taking account of specific sector and territorial characteristics and the order of priority of the tasks facing labor collectives. It is important to make fuller use of the movement's potential for educating each of its participants in the spirit of collectivism, high responsibility for work, conscious discipline, and intolerance of mismanagement and wastefulness. The initiative of leading teams which accept young people and workers who have just entered production or workers who have violated the production or social order must be given all-around support.

The USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems and the AUCCTU are instructed, considering available experience, to elaborate and introduce the necessary changes and additions to the normative documents on team labor organization and remuneration.

The USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, and editorial offices of central, sector, and local newspapers, journals, and publishing houses are instructed to more actively propagandize the socioeconomic and educational meaning of the valuable workers' initiative to collectively guarantee the strict observance in production of discipline and order and of the norms of social conduct and to ensure effective coverage of labor collectives' leading experience.

'Sociocultural' Construction

PM081057 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 87 Second Edition pp 1, 3

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] On 26 March 1987 the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers adopted a resolution "On Measures to Ensure Fulfillment of the Targets Ratified in the 12th 5-Year Plan for the Development of the Material and Technical Base of the Sociocultural Sphere."

The resolution notes that the social policy for the 12th 5-Year Plan worked out by the 27th party congress plans to ensure a substantial improvement in the people's prosperity and to create the conditions for more fruitful labor activity by Soviet people. Capital investment in the development of the material and technical base of the sociocultural area has been considerably increased. The country has fulfilled the plans for commissioning housing, general education schools, and outpatient medical institutions.

At the same time the acuteness of the question is not diminishing. There has been no fundamental breakthrough in strengthening the material and technical base of the sociocultural area. The plans laid down in 1986 for commissioning preschool institutions, hospitals, homes for the aged and infirm, clubs, culture centers, and boarding schools have not been fulfilled. Construction of vocational and technical colleges has been frustrated. Many ministries, departments, republics, and oblasts have failed to ensure the planned commissioning of housing.

This is due to a considerable extent to the fact that ministries, departments, and republic and local organs still underestimate the political importance of resolving social tasks. The fact that the funds allocated for these purposes by the state are not being assimilated is absolutely intolerable. [paragraph continues]

The construction of housing and other sociocultural projects by the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee, the USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Communications Equipment Industry, the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, and the USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry in the Georgian, Uzbek, Tajik, Kazakh, Kirghiz, and Armenian SSR's and in Pskov, Rostov, Astrakhan, Kemerovo, Chita, Murmansk, Smolensk, Ryazan, Kurgan, and other RSFSR oblasts has been conducted particularly unsatisfactorily.

There is major concern that the state of affairs is not improving in 1987, either. Many leaders of central and local organs continue to approach the strengthening of the material and technical base of the sociocultural area as a secondary matter, have not brought into play all reserves for building up construction volume and commissioning housing and other sociocultural projects, and have failed to encourage all working people and the entire population to struggle for the implementation of targets.

With a view to more rapidly overcoming the lags in developing the material and technical base of the sociocultural area and accelerating the resolution of the housing problem in the country, the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers ratified the targets for 1988-1990 for the commissioning of sociocultural projects in the USSR as a whole, stipulating that the volume of housing construction be increased from the 595 million square meters previously envisaged by the 5-year plan to 630 million square meters and that the targets for the construction of other sociocultural projects be more evenly distributed. In 1988 the volume of construction of schools, preschool institutions, vocational and technical colleges, clubs, medical centers, homes for labor veterans and the aged, and children's centers sill increase by 50-100 percent in comparison with 1986.

Union republic communist parties and Councils of Ministers, CPSU kraykoms and obkoms, krayispolkoms and oblispolkoms, USSR ministries and departments, and party, soviet, trade union, and Komsomol organizations are required to consider the fulfillment of the set targets for developing the material and technical base of the sociocultural area as a matter of paramount political importance. They are instructed to take exhaustive measures to fundamentally improve the construction of these projects and to ensure the permitted lags are made up. The thorough examination and development of measures to improve these targets, which should be considered the minimum, are to be directly organized locally in labor collectives. Organizational work to spread the initiative of the collectives at the Gorkiy Motor Vehicle Plant, the "Avtovaz" Production Association, and other front-ranking enterprises in making extensive use of additional potential for ensuring the accelerated resolution of social problems is to be stepped up. Effective and meaningful monitoring of the fulfillment of the plans for housing, cultural, and consumer construction are to be established, and openness is to be increased in the work to implement them.

Leaders of ministries, departments, and local party and soviet organs have been warned about their personal responsibility for the fulfillment of the set plans for housing and social construction and for the utilization of all reserves to that goal. The activity of party, soviet, and economic workers in implementing the party's social policy will be assessed on the basis of the results of the practical implementation of those plans within a strictly defined timeframe.

The attention of the USSR Gosstroy and construction complex ministries was drawn to the unsatisfactory work in building hospitals, preschool institutions, clubs, and vocational and technical colleges, to the unjustifiable reduction in the pace of civic housing construction in a number of parts of the country, to the slow transition to economic management methods, and to the poor utilization of the capacity of the production base of construction, and they were instructed to take effective measures to eradicate those shortcomings.

The USSR Gosstroy, the USSR Gosplan, and the USSR Gossnab together with construction and other interested ministries and departments have been instructed to submit for examination by the CPSU Central Committee within the very near future proposals on developing the construction materials industry, cement production, the material and technical base of the construction of housing and other social projects, and the development of construction, road, and municipal machine building in 1987-1995.

Union republic Councils of Ministers, ministries, and departments have been instructed to provide projects in the sociocultural area with the necessary volume of contracting work in accordance with the existing normatives for construction duration, to accelerate the widespread introduction of 2-year planning for the construction of the aforesaid projects, to channel additionally into new housing and other sociocultural projects not less than 10 percent of the capital investment envisaged for production construction from all sources, to strengthen construction organizations, to give them the necessary assistance, and to step up the demand that established targets be fulfilled.

It was deemed necessary to step up social control of the progress in fulfilling the program for building housing and other sociocultural projects laid down for the 12th 5-Year Plan. Construction of these projects must be extensively discussed at labor collective meetings, in the press, on the radio, and television. Those who undermine the fulfillment of planned targets or underestimate the resolution of social questions are to be keenly criticized. The front-ranking experience of housing, social, and cultural constuction is to be systematically generalized and propagandized.

The USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Social Development and the USSR Gosstroy have been instructed to step up their monitoring of the implementation of the targets envisaged for the 12th 5-Year Plan, to efficiently resolve any questions that may arise, and to give ministries and departments the help they need.

The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers expressed the firm conviction that party, soviet, and economic organs, labor collectives, and trade union and Komsomol organizations would launch an extensive and universal struggle to strengthen the material and technical base of the sociocultural area and fulfill the targets laid down by this resolution, which marks a substantive stage in the implementation of the party's social policy and in improving Soviet people's prosperity.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON WRITERS' UNION PLENUM

Paper Carries Resolution

PM051130 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 11

["Resolution of the USSR Writers' Union Board Plenum"]

[Text] The period which has elapsed since the Eighth USSR Writers' Congress has demonstrated the union's desire for changes in literary life and in the work of Soviet writers, who have responded to the party's call for restructuring and the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development. [paragraph continues]

The strategic course adopted at the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and at the 27th party congress has become the basis of the USSR Writers' Union's organizational and creative activity.

Taking into account the demands of the time, the board and secretariat, having analyzed the proposals and criticisms heard at the writers' congress, focused their attention on creative questions and on establishing in their day-to-day activity the principles of democracy, openness, and social justice. The secretariat's structure has changed: A Secretariat Bureau has been set up, which is called upon to resolve fundamental questions of creative life, and new public and creative councils for different genres have been organized.

There have been a number of creative discussions which have demonstrated the increased social activeness of writers and their commitment to tackling major tasks and creating an atmosphere of ideological and artistic exactingness and principle.

A restructuring process has begun in literary life, although there are still many unresolved problems which require major efforts both by the leadership organs of the USSR Writers' Union and by all writers and all members of our creative union.

The development of Soviet literature in recent times has been marked by the desire to honestly and comprehensively depict reality and to resolutely renounce the varnishing and time-serving which occurred during the period of stagnation. The restructuring of the literary consciousness is expressed in the development of a critical and analytical trend in the interpretation of vital processes in works in the most diverse genres and different stylistic currents, and in the strengthening of the contemporary relevance of literature in general. A certain part has been played in the development of a soberly realistic view of the social and moral phenomena of life by the publication in literary journals of a number of works from past years which had hitherto remained unknown to the reader. The honest, principled analysis of contradictions and difficulties and the frank and open discussion of negative phenomena which has emerged in our literature is an important and necessary step along the path to the resolution by literature of its strategic tasks in participation in the revolutionary transformation of life which is being carried out by the party and people.

At the same time it must be acknowledged that too few works have so far been created whose ideological and artisitic potential is up to the spirit of the times, works revealing the party's role as the guiding force of Soviet society and depicting the people's historical role in the restructuring. The heroes of our time, active fighters for the transformation of society's life, have yet to step from life into the pages of novels and novellas, poems and plays. The general literary stream produces many examples of colorlessness, facelessness, poverty of idea and feeling, and social and spiritual apathy.

Contemporary literature faces this task: Without losing the analytical mood or blunting the edge of social criticism, to bring about a turn toward the creation of large-scale characters and the depiction of those people who bear on their shoulders the burden of our times, pave the way to restructuring the renewal, and pioneer the new. The experience of restructuring needs artistic crystallization and interpretation. It is necessary to transmit by means of artistic words the creative thrust of the changes taking place in the country, changes which open the way to the establishment of the high ideals of Soviet society.

On the eve of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution Soviet literature is mobilizing and pooling its forces, directing them toward the tackling of the imposing and crucial tasks set by the times. The artists of the word face the important goal of revealing the organic link between the achievements of the October Revolution and today's revolutionary social transformations in our country.

Soviet writers are the heirs of the glorious traditions of the literature born in October, the literature which prepared the revolution and played an active part in the establishment and development of revolutionary ideals. The destiny of our literature is inseparable from the destiny of the revolution. Contemporary prose, poetry, and drama seek to interpret profoundly, thoughtfully, and honestly the experience of 7 decades of soviet power as the period of the triumph of the socialist system, which has withstood the test of history, the test of the terrible and dramatic 20th century. The restructuring of public life and the expansion of democracy and openness are the logical continuation of the fruitful creative activity of many generations of Soviet people and the development of the revolutionary patriotic traditions of the party and people. Without closing our eyes to contradictions, difficulties, and errors, we must show the millions of readers that the history of the socialist system is not a succession of errors and disappointments, but a complex path of creation of a new, historically unprecedented system. Literature's task is to struggle for the further development of democracy, reflect the interests and opinions of various social strata and groups, and strengthen people's faith in our revolution and pride in the socialist fatherland.

Today we again reaffirm our loyalty to the basic principles of Soviet multinational literature — the principles of orientation toward party and people, patriotism, and internationalism. Our ideological and aesthetic platform is still the artistic method developed during the revolutionary era — socialist realism, which today requires creative development and enrichment and truly innovative application to the resolution of today's tasks.

All genres of our literature must become more actively involved in the restructuring process. Contemporary prose needs to deepn its social analysis of reality, do more to overcome banality and descriptiveness, be sensitive to the new things in life, support positive phenomena more decisively, and uncompromisingly condemn whatever prevents as from moving forward. A heightening of the ideological and civic tone of poetic works is an urgent demand for poetry. The all-around, dynamic interpretation of social and moral conflicts which arise in the course of the restructuring is the task of drama.

There should be all-around support for the experience of modern current affairs writing, which reacts promptly to social transformations and participates effectively in their implementation.

Literature for children and young people has a high ideological and artistic responsibility, being called upon to prepare a new generation for life, raising it in the spirit of today's revolutionary changes. Children's and young people's literature needs more keen, committed attention from writers in general and from literary critics.

Considerable responsibiflity for the practical resolution of the tasks of improving the ideological and artistic quality of works in all genres rests with the public creative councils of the USSR Writers' Union, which are called upon to create an atmosphere of lofty exactingness, commitment to the creative growth of writers, and equal dialogue between the different, promising ideological and stylistic trends in the contemporary literary process.

Work with creative young people must be raised to a qualitatively new level. It is necessary to resolutely overcome the inertia phenomena of recent years: lack of confidence in young people, the artificial delaying of young craftsmen's entry into literature, the leveling out of the creative individualities of new authors, and the adaptation of their quest to fit established stereotypes. Work with young writers must be based on the principle of high ideological and artistic exactingness, making no allowances, and at the same time on the principle of a sensitive, solicitous attitude to talent. It is necessary to trust young people, to create the conditions for them to engage in the quest, the conditions for the boldest creative experiments -- and at the same time to bring new writers into energetic activity and orient them toward the truly up-to-date handling of large-scale, topical themes. Constant concern for the education of young talents and for the worthwhile replenishment of the ranks of the USSR Writers' Union is the duty of all the country's writers' organizations.

An important task of the USSR Writers' Union is to enhance the social prestige and practical effectiveness of literary-artistic criticism. It is necessary to resolutely eradicate the vestiges of the old conservative habits and the inertia of regarding criticism as a means of serving the ambitions of individual writers, and to combat recurrences of the habit of handing out servile compliments and subjective scoldings.

Criticism is the main means of developing an objective social evaluation of the current literary process, and needs the respect and confidence of writers. In our literature it is impermissible for there to be zones which are beyond criticism, works which are artificially protected from keen analysis and unbiased assessment, from polemics on the essence of the topical questions raised by the writer. Today's criticism needs to gain a mastery of the art of thinking in terms of problems, it needs a broad ideological and aesthetic outlook, democratic accessibility, and freedom from group standards and partialities.

Criticism is experiencing an urgent need for the in-depth elaboration of the theoretical principles of its activity and the acquisition of clear and precise evaluation criteria. Criticism's task also includes the interpretation and propagandization of the artistic experience of Soviet classics and the competent, historically specific evaluation of the strong and weak aspects of those works of the past which are today being published for the first time or else after a long interval.

There are serious shortcomings in the work of the USSR Writers' Union Board and its secretariat. Bureaucratic leadership methods and obsolete forms of work have not yet been entirely eradicated. The USSR Writers' Union leadership organs lack persistence and consistency in establishing new principles and a truly creative foundation in their activity. At literary events one can still sense elements of "overorganization," and many jubilee and special subject conferences, meetings, and soirees have little to do with today's vital problems. The failure to resolve a whole series of urgent problems is due to the fact that they were not exposed in good time.

The gulf between word and deed has resulted in the fact that the secretariat bureau meets too infrequently and too little practical assistance is given to writers.

The democratization of literary life and the establishment of an atmosphere of openness and confidence are hampered by the phenomena of factionalism, attacks and counterattacks, and the struggle for a dominant position which have become widespread among writers. At writers' meetings and discussions we have sometimes heard ill-thought-out speeches which disorient public opinion. [paragraph continues]

There are instances of the use of press organs for personal self-interest, the settling of scores, and futile group skirmishes. Such negative phenomena are impermissible, they hamper normal creative work and undermine the prestige of writing, which should set an example in the struggle for the moral cleansing of society. It is necessary to establish in literary life and in the leadership of literature a spirit of frankness, criticism and self-criticism, efficiency and constructiveness.

The activity of literary-artistic journals needs further improvement; they are called upon to familiarize a wide readership with the best new works of contemporary literature and publicize the problems of literary development in articles, roundups, and reviews. The quest for new forms of presentation of materials and real contact with readers is by no means being pursued by all journals. There is a lack of attention to contemporary artistic literature in the activity of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, which has achieved great success in current affairs and propaganda work.

Questions of the restructuring of book publishing are only slowly being resolved. The work of many publishing houses is marked by bureaucratic inertia and indifference to authors and the fate of their works. The USSR Writers' Union Board Bureau and the newly created council for publishing affairs are called upon to make great efforts to ensure that book publishing and distribution are put on an up-to-date footing and are efficient, organized, and well thought out.

Having heard and discussed the report of V. Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers' Union Board, "Literature and the Present Day," the USSR Writers' Union Board plenum resolves:

1. To deem it the most important task of the USSR Writers' Union Board and the country's writers' organizations to pool creative forces and mobilize them to tackle the most important tasks of the time and provide an artistic reflection and interpretation of the revolutionary transformations of public life being implemented by the party and people. It is the task of Soviet literature to assimilate the social and spiritual experience accumulated by the country in its 7 decades of socialist history.

2. The USSR Writers' Union public creative councils are to focus their efforts on creating an atmosphere of high exactingness and principle, free and equal exchange of opinions, concepts, and assessments, concern for the ideological and creative growth of writers, and uncovering of their creative potential.

3. In the leadership of literary life, to follow the principles of democracy, openness, and social justice. Resolutely to overcome the manifestations occurring in literary life of factionalism, prejudice, lack of respect for professional comrades, and the trend toward rule by administrative decree and dictatorialness [vozhdizm].

4. To increase the prestige and real effectiveness of literary-artistic criticism, improving its work methods, developing scientifically substantiated criteria, establishing respect for criticism in the literary milieu, improving the standard of polemics, and upholding the ethical norms of debates.

5. To step up attention toward creative young people and the education of new literary recruits. In work with new writers, to combine high ideological and artistic exactingness with a solicitous attitude to talent.

6. To raise to a radically new standard the work of restructuring the activity of literary-artistic journals and the book publishing process and improving contacts between drama writing and the theater.

7. To instruct the USSR Writers' Union Board Secretariat to analyze all criticisms and proposals from plenum participants and elaborate and implement practical measures to put them into practice.

Kunyayev Addresses Board

PM110900 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 7

[Abbreviated account of speech by Stanislav Kunyayev (Moscow) at 27-28 April USSR Writers' Union Board of Plenum]

[Text] It seems to me that the meeting of the RSFSR Writers' Union Board Secretariat held in March identified in good time and for all to hear the negative phenomena which flourished in the pages of some of our periodicals. Many of us read with alarm and emotion Yu. Bondarev's words that "the pseudodemocrats in the sphere of literature have kindled on the brink of the abyss the torch of openness stolen from justice and truth. This stolen openness is presented by our information media and press one-sidedly -- the aggressive, destructive side which opens the gates wide for mediocrity, ambitious individuals, and false Jacobins...".

My first impression from these words was this: Is not Yuriy Vasilyevich exaggerating the heat of passions?

But the further events developed, the clearer it became to me that he is largely right to be so concerned. Forces have indeed come to life in literature which hunger for diktat, and when they sense resistance, they seek to promote a split. In the first instance their will is directed toward imposing on public opinion the evaluative cliches which suit them. One of these is to intimidate us with the internal class enemy, usually clad in Russian national dress. In the poem "The Okhotnyy Row Merchant" ["Okhotnoryadets"] (ZNAMYA No 4), Ye. Yevtushenko imagines the class enemy thus: He drinks, paws the cook, has a gold chain hanging right across his belly.

Yevtushenko is not the first to wage the struggle against storekeepers and merchants. He had his ideological precursors. Let us recall some verses published in a journal in 1930.

> I propose that Minin and Pozharskiy be melted down.
> Why should they be on a pedestal?
> We have had enough of glorifying two storekeepers,
> October found them at their store counters.
>
> They were lucky we did not wring their necks.
> I know it would have been the right thing to do.
> Just think -- they saved Russia!
> Would it perhaps have been better not to save it?

[Reference is to Red Square statue of two 17th century popular heroes]

I do not think today's poet has set himself the task of rousing anticultural hysteria to the level of the thirties. I believe that it is from thoughtlessness, the inability to handle history with care.

Take the article by the prose writer B. Vasilyev in SOVETSKIY EKRAN on the movie "Repentance." The article is written with passion and contains many interesting ideas. True, there are also naive opinions like this: "My eyes were opened when I saw Tengiz Abuladze's movie..." Or: "He has lifted from many eyes the cataract of slavish indifference." On reading this, you cannot help wanting to ask the popular writer: What about the 20th, 22d, and 27th CPSU Congresses, if Vasilyev had not seen the movie would he really have gone on living with the "cataract of slavish indifference"? But everyone's eyes are opened in his own time.

The ideological cliches which appear in our press disorient the young generation of writers, introducing into their minds the idea of a split, of the creation of informal literary organizations not as a supplement and aid, but as a confrontation and counterweight to the Writers' Union.

Let us see which writers and critics have most often been attacked in recent years: Belov, Astafyev, Soloukhin, Bondarev, Lobanov, Yur. Kuznetsov, Lykoshin, Loshits, Valentin Sidorov, Pikul, Lev Gumilev — well known names in Russian prose, poetry, critical thought....

Nor is it pleasant that after the critical campaign organized against them, Kozhinov, Lobanov, Lyubomudrov, Loshits, and V. Sidorov found it hard to get into print. Their replies in their own defense, explaining their position — and each of them wrote such replies — were not printed anywhere. Is that democracy and openness?

Why did criticism concentrate its fire on the names of the best Russian writers? Do you think it is because they write badly? No, they write well, and they are castigated not for their style and language, but because they raise ideas and areas of life on which many of our criticics and thinkers impose a taboo.

V. Belov tackled the topic — banned, to these critics' way of thinking — of leaving, renouncing Soviet citizenship; he touched a national sore point, and the cry went up: "Taboo!" But why should this topic be banned for literature? Politicians talk about it, journalists talk about it on television, television lineups have become deeply involved in it. Why not Belov? He is a Soviet Russian writer, and all the griefs, all the sores, all the hopes and dreams of our society, in each of its national cells — Russian, Georgian, Kazakh, Jewish — all this is our common historical inheritance, and when a writer of such great talent and conscience as Belov or Astafyev touches these sores, it is our duty to approve him and say "thank you" to him for his courage, not to shout out "Don't touch!" As writers, if we do not talk openly about our national ills, we will be doing a disservice to the revolutionary process which is taking place in our country. Because, apart from the principle of social justice, there is also the principle of national justice.

The situation regarding the existence and teaching of native languages in the republics (I share the distress felt by Nil Gilevich and Boris Oleynik), the vulgar class approach to national cultural assets, the pragmatic pressure of short-term politics which oversimplifies the full complexity of the nations' life and histories -- all this exists in life, yet scarcely at all in literature, because there has always been a taboo in our literature: Do not touch on the nationalities question, or if you do, paint it only in the most favorable tones possible....

Here is something a certain Kazakh poet recently published in his local press: "To be proud of our native language, protect its purity, and promote its development is one of the main duties of every Kazakh, every Kazakh family, the entire population. The people's strength is the strength of the language. We must make our native language one of the most... cultured and richest languages. This is our duty today, and the duty of future generations."

No doubt every one of us, on thinking about his own native language, will say the same, in his heart. But what is the comment on this natural appeal: "In the words about concern for the development of the native language...one can perceive national egotism".... Yes, I think any normal Kazakh will be indignant when he reads that in the newspaper. I would be indignant in his place, and I would think: There you are, Russification. Does someone perhaps want such feelings about the Russians to appear in the republics? If not, why be so tactless about a healthy concern for one's language? This concern has nothing in common with the hooligan excesses provoked in Alma-Ata by the opponents of the restructuring. The nationalities question is a delicate matter, and it is no use lumping everything together. It was for good reason that M.S. Gorbachev recently said at a conference of leaders of the mass media: "We are in favor of a respectful attitude toward the national feelings, history, culture, and language of all peoples, in favor of complete and actual equality."

I believe that when Yu. Bondarev spoke of what we are going through in culture, he had many circumstances in mind. Does not the appearance in our press of a letter from dissidents, setting conditions and giving us prescriptions for how and to what extent to develop our democracy, constitute an ideological onslaught? Is not rock music, which should not be banned, but should not be propagandized by powerful state media either, a phenomenon of the same order? I agree with Yuriy Sergeyevich in this assessment.

As for the kind of statements the journal YUNOST sinks to, I quote from the issue for March of this year: "The bureaucratic apparatus" "engendered semidissident sentiments." Or from the same article, where the author writes about a certain criminal Komsomol organizer who killed his girlfriend. Why did he kill her? Because — I quote: "He was corrupted by Komsomol doggerel and the kind of literature that embellishes reality." But perhaps this is a kind of self-criticism by YUNOST's chief editor A. Dementyev, who has also written a great deal about the Komsomol? Things are becoming absurd, Comrades. Is not this, in M.S. Gorbachev's words, "anarchy and permissiveness"? Both our Komsomol and our bureaucracy have many defects. But one thing you can count on: They have not raised any murderers or dissidents. It is just that we have started printing millions of copies of something feeble-minded, we are drunk on too much democracy....

What would you say about a passage in that same YUNOST: "Elementary 'social introspection' is 'frequently' described as 'civic-mindedness' in literature.... It cannot be otherwise, if our writers tackle the problems of the diversion of the northern rivers...".

How can people speak with such cold, snobbish cynicism of the great civic feat of Zalygin, Rasputin, Belov — we all know who it was who engaged in the struggle over the diversion of the northern rivers — how can their selfless deeds for the people's good be dismissed as "elementary social introspection"! For some reason, over the many years of this agonizing struggle, neither the journal YUNOST nor its chief authors displayed any of this elementary "social introspection." Perhaps that is why today they indulge in this "false Jacobin" grambling in speaking so scornfully of the zealots' feat.

It is time we realized all this demagogic terminology is in the way of true consolidation.

Let us treat our history and each other more attentively, carefully, and respectfully.... Our task is to strengthen our Writers' Union. May it emerge from the restructuring rejuvenated, cleansed of dogmas and group passions, so as to become in the future a reliable support for the party and people!

Feliks Kuznetsov Speaks

PM061030 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 2

[Abbreviated account of speech delivered by Feliks Kuznetsov (Moscow) at 27-28 April USSR Writers' Union Board Plenum]

[Text] The task of the plenum we have so long awaited is clearly to synchronize our watches in the most important matter — the strategy of restructuring in the spiritual sphere of our society's life — and to use our collective intelligence to develop the concept of restructuring in literature and in the spiritual sphere of life in general.

For me personally, two questions seem particularly important here: one — what the restructuring gives literature itself; two — what literature and art can and should give to the restructuring, to the revolutionary people. It might appear that these questions are automatically linked: The more the restructuring gives literature and art, the more they will give to the restructuring and the people in return. But no! It could also happen that the restructuring will give much to literature and art, but they will give the restructuring far less than the people expect. In the agitation of the initial period of the restructuring, we should remember one simple and sober question: What next? What next, when the portfolios have been redistributed, when the cinema, theater, and literature have to settle their accounts, and settle them with creative work worthy of the times and our country's traditions?

Let us say thankfully: The restructuring has already given a great deal to literature and art. First and foremost, an unprecedented freedom of self-expression, liberation from the stifling fetters of bureaucratic tutelage. We can see the strength and might with which our best, most outstanding artists and their works, events of the present day, are working for the restructuring, on the basis of the groundwork, the plowed field of the people's truth, grief, and conscience, the field which they themselves and their comrades steadfastly and fearlessly cultivated for long years, preparing for the time of today's changes. We can see the reserve stock of humanism, humanity, and artistic experience which waited motionless and in vain for decades, until the party should discover it today for cultural and scientific exploitation. We can see how the implacable sense of involvement in current affairs, the sense of civic duty developed, drew itself up, and gained strength in our literature, that unyielding and impassioned fighter for the ecology of nature, the ecology of culture, and the ecology of our history. This applies both to the whole of Soviet literature and to Moscow writers of the older, intermediate, and young generations, who, with very few exceptions, form a sound, honest detachment of Soviet writers deserving of the deepest respect and devoutly oriented toward changes.

But what causes alarm, what makes us look not only with hope, but also with uneasiness toward tomorrow in our country's culture, what makes us voice serious concern about it? [paragraph continues]

Why, for all our joy at the revival of our cultural and literary life and unprecendented freedom of its development and self-expression, do our hearts still ache for tomorrow, not only for literature and culture, but for our people's very morality?

Above all, because talent, conscience, integrity, and thought have not yet won the appropriate, central place in the universe of our creative union!

The torrent of mediocrity, banality, and pragmatism is not dying down, and has no desire to give ground. Moreover, triumphant banality is taking on new faces and new facets of being.

Let me speak of one phenomenon which has recently been particularly worrying. In the conditions of total freedom of creative self-expression, the aspiritual, amoral principles of multifaceted consumerist, neobourgeois "mass culture" are today manifesting themselves, I would say, with increasing aggressiveness, with the claim that the restructuring is virtually being carried out for their sake, for the sake of their triumph and victorious self-assertion, with the claim to a virtual monopoly of the restructuring in culture. This aggressive onslaught of aspirituality, shameless cafe chantant mentality, moral permissiveness and ideological eclecticism, "highs" and "kicks" is encroaching on the most powerful means of influencing human souls -- television, the movies, radio, popular entertainment, theater, literature, poetry, popular song, and music. It is encroaching on what is most sacred -- our tomorrow, our young people! This is roundly contrary to the spirit and demands of the new times.

A certain perplexing, alarming, and, I would say, discouraging distortion has emerged in our spiritual life. We are now mercilessly ridding ourselves of corruption, unearned income, and the newly emerged nouveau riche society which, under the conditions of stagnation, had begun virtually openly to run the show and impose on people its inverted system of values, its own "aesthetics" and its own "morality." As the economists, and, indeed, the criminologists, assert, during the years of stagnation there emerged a whole area of uncontrolled or "black" economy, along with unearned income that was relatively widespread and sometimes on an enormous scale.

Let us ask ourselves: Did not this iniquitous existence, this uncontrolled "black" economy, interwoven with criminal bureaucratic elements, give birth to its own petty bourgeois consciousness? It was a breeding ground for our own consumerist "mass culture," homespun, so to speak, but intermingled with foreign models.

So why, today, when we are throwing out these latter-day "nouveau riches," are we allowing this shamelessly bourgeois element, born in the times of stagnation, fat, clamorous, and indifferent to the people's life, to attack, in the form of "mass culture," our popular entertainment, our mass media, and ultimately our culture, literature, morals, and morality?

Let us at last realize that the essence of the consumerist model of "mass culture" lies in its appeal to unrestrained instincts, to gut feeling, to aspirituality and social apathy as a principle and a norm, to that very national nihilism that N. Gilevich spoke of. All this is in direct opposition to the tasks of restructuring, the tasks of cultivating in people spiritual commitment, patriotism, social and civic activeness, and political consciousness. We must rise to the defense of the human soul, and especially the soul of the young person who is beginning modern-day life, with the same passion with which writers rose to protect nature and historical monuments.

The Writers' Union, literary science, literary-artistic criticism, and the press still interpret only poorly and superficially the very complex and at times highly contradictory processes which are today taking place in the spiritual area of society's life. They are only poorly combating ideological and philosophical eclecticism and the threat of "mass culture" on the one hand, and dogmatism and vulgar primitivism in the interpretation of literature and art on the other.

Dogmatism and vulgarization in the approach to literature is very clearly displayed, for instance, in the article "Flirting With the Divine" by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Kryvelev, published some time ago in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. On the basis of quotations taken out of context and without even waiting for the publication of the novel "The Scaffold" to be completed, Kryvelev, you will remember, did not hesitate to accuse our major artists -- Ch. Aytmatov, V. Astafyev, and V. Bykov -- of "god-seeking" and "god-building." But when I, as a critic, tried to explain to the newspaper's readers this is not true and these and others of our best writers are not seeking God in their works, but conscience, good, and honor, and are sounding the alarm bells about the threat of aspirituality for what may be a significant proportion of our people, the editorial office did not allow me to do so. Some 4 months after receiving my article, the editorial board gave me the following written explanation of the reasons for refusing to publish it: "Philosophical errors even by important writers (and far more important writers than those criticized by our newspaper), as you know from literary history, are not as rare as one would wish... Criticism's task is to see these errors and help the reader to see them. Everything you say... in no way justifies the tendency which actually exists at present in literature toward god-building, the rehabilitation of gospel morality, and the admiration of religion in our history. The Soviet writer should seek real, not mystical means of helping society." That is said in connection with the position of Ch. Atymatov, V. Astafyev, and V. Bykov. Mysticism, indeed! A total failure to understand the special characteristics of literature, its concerns, its cry from the heart. That is called openness? Free debate in the quest for truth? The struggle the party calls on us to wage against dogmatism and the monopolization of truth?

You cannot turn openness into a one-way street and have a monopoly of the truth. Today the way must be open for healthy debates and discussions on questions of our society's spiritual life, so that in the clash of opinions a genuine party viewpoint can be worked out, a viewpoint which avoids like the plague both ideological vacuity on the one hand, and dogmatism and vulgar sociologism on the other. We must clearly see both shores in our struggle for restructuring in literature: the danger of vulgarization, but also the danger of philosophical and ideological eclecticism. Only through true orientation toward the people and the party and the most profound patriotism and socialist internationalism in literature will we reach the necessary and anticipated result in the restructuring of our ranks.

Oleynik on 'Developments'

PM071142 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 pp 2-3

[Abbreviated account of speech by Boris Oleynik (Ukraine) at 27-28 April USSR Writers' Union Board Plenum]

[Text] Comrades, I am not alone in having sometimes been worried: Might we not wear out a good idea with too much talk, too much "blather"? After all, we now find among us a good many who are not only nightingales, but cocks of the restructuring, who only want to sing and crow, whether or not it is getting light.

To the joy and honor of everything healthy and energetic in our society, words are already being turned into concrete deeds. The report by V. Karpov and the speeches by M. Alekseyev, F. Kuznetsov, N. Gilevich, and G. Baklanov are evidence of this.

Positive developments are most clearly visible in the economic sphere. They are less noticeable in the management, scientific, and creative sphere, where gaps and blanks can be covered with placards and semantic juggling. All the same, the wind of renewal can be felt here, too. Not as dynamically as one would wish, but all the same....

But I have caught myself slipping into the old ways of inertia -- taking the still hot matrix of change from the economic and political sphere and stamping it forcibly onto the quivering fabric of culture in general and literature in particular. Yet Lenin warned: "The cultural task cannot be resolved as quickly as political and military tasks.... By the very nature of the task, more time is needed here, and it is necessary to adapt to this longer interval, planning your work and displaying the greatest possible steadfastness, persistence, and systematicness." If only, let us add, because the determining, generic trait of literature is continuity. The very best intentions of the most progressive changes can lead to highly deplorable consequences if a single link in the system of continuity is destroyed. After all, the new thinking that we now preach is inherent in the very biology of every work, if it is truly a work of talent, since the creative vision is equivalent to prescience. Otherwise it is only an illustration of events.

If you look from this angle at the literary process even over the last 20 years, the period affected by the virus of stagnation, by no means all writers, but real writers have always fought honestly for the renewal of society and the democratization of social relations, upheld the sacred right to tell the whole truth, defended nature and historical monuments and the purity of the primordial sources, fought for the restoration of Leninist norms and the publication of works by writers who were unjustly suppressed or simply forgotten. This, you would think, is their hour of glory. After all, they worked for this hour courageously and in conditions that were not the most favorable, often earning black eyes for their pains.

But somehow it turned out that the machinery of democracy they had won through their efforts, the mouthpieces of openness, began to be used vigorously by those who, in the times of stagnation, had not been notable for their activeness. Nor had they "put themselves forward" very much in creative terms. Paradoxically enough, the voices of the pioneers of restructuring are gradually becoming lost in their harmonious chorus. It would not matter, but certain soloists are mounting the platform and taking the television and radio microphones as if they had appeared from other worlds to impose order on our solar system. Making use of the phraseology of the critical period and smashing anything and everything, they frequently go so far to the right or the left that they go clean out of sight. The slightest observation with regard to gross distortions that damage the very essence of restructuring is opportunistically interpreted as an encroachment on democracy. Then, without pausing for breath, they very democratically intimidate their opponents by virtually declaring a "holy war" on them. If this affects me personally, for instance, I could accuse my opponents of elementary unprofessionalism: trying to intimidate a rank-and-file party committee secretary, "raised at spear-point," for whom heightened combat readiness is a natural state of soul and body, is an absolute waste of time and ammunition.

As a private soldier of literature, I can allow myself a joke. But it is no joking matter when under cover of the renewal of values people open fire -- frontal and targeted -- against individuals who determine the standard of our multinational literature.

I am ashamed to say that I thought such phenomena were characteristic of our region alone. Unfortunately I was wrong: It seems that the same is happening in Russia and in the other fraternal republics. The pattern that emerges is very alarming -- it is specifically the outstanding individuals who are the targets. Could this be because they are visible from afar?

There is, of course, an element of envy. From time immemorial, mediocrity has not forgiven and never will forgive genuine talent. Talent hampers mediocrity even as a background, in whose clear light colorlessness stands out especially noticeably. Here there is a very apposite expression: "The whites start the game, but the grays win." But if it were only envy that was active here, sooner or later everything would fall into place; in any restructuring, constant values remain unchanged, and the whole of UNESCO could not fill in the gap left by lack of talent.

Another aspect is alarming: While correctly demanding the restoration of the missing links in the spiritual line, that is, the publication of those who have unjustly lain silent, sometimes, instead of adding these assets to the existing ones, we try to use them as replacements or substitutes for the assets acquired over the decades, and sometimes to counterpose one to the other. And ought we adopt them all, en bloc? We are scolded from "over there" for having too much of an ideology fixation. But it was not they, but we who recalled that there are values higher than class ambitions... There are dominant ideas common to all mankind, and chief among them is life itself, for the sake of whose preservation our side has put forward that most noble idea of entering the third millenium without nuclear weapons. The same applies to the preservation of the natural environment.

Yes, we must add to our spiritual potential all the still unutilized assets, both at home and those that are to be found elsewhere. Each republic could compile a lamentable register. For instance, back in the sixties we tried to publish some works by Vladimir Vinnichenko, a man with a complex, ambivalent, and politically uneven destiny. This major writer is also ambivalent in creative terms, but some of his works, especially those from the pre-October period, are to a large degree progressive. Take, for instance, one of his stories, which depicts a certain martyr for the Ukraine who, landing up in a dungeon for his excessively belligerent separatism and learning that there were Russians with him in that same institution, organized a demonstration under the slogan "Get the Russian butcherrs out of Ukrainian jails!" It is hard to find a more lethal mockery of nationalism in its heaviest, most leaden form!

Consequently, after a sound analysis and after excising everything erroneous, this writer should be published. And so should the works of Academician Yavornitskiy on the history of the Zaporzhye Cossaks, and the collection of annals, and much, much more. Much, but not everything. After all, in every self-respecting country there are fundamental philosophical principles that have become part of society's very nature. And society naturally rejects what is organically hostile to it, unless it wants to betray itself or change.

For instance, Gippius never concealed her absolute hostility to the October Revolution. Moreover, she did not betray her nature, even in the most terrible hour for our motherland, the hour of the fascist invasion. [paragraph continues]

I am sure that, true to her nature, Zinaida Nikolayevna, as a person of integrity, would have protested our clumsy attempts to count her creative work among the assets of the Land of the Soviets, which was utterly inimical to her. And yet that is what we are trying to do....

We are accused of maximalism and intolerance, which is said to be the consequence of late industrialization and nonparliamentary development, and of the faults of tribal and communal atavism and little short of blood fueds. But look at Knut Hamsun, great writer not only in his own country, but in world literature. And Norway cannot in any way be accused of later industrialization, ideological intolerance, and so forth. Yet the Norwegians themselves condemned Knut Hamsun, in their severest court, for cooperation with the occupying forces, despite the fact that he is a great writer and was well over 80 years old. Moreover his son renounced his father.

No doubt Ezra Pound is by no means an insigificant poet, yet to this day he has not been forgiven (nor is he likely to be) for his cooperation with Mussolini. So there are crimes that cannot be compensated for with talent even of the highest quality: betrayal of the motherland, the flouting of the very nature of the system, its faith, all that the people hold holy. Regardless of philosophy or level of industrialization. So why do we have these outbursts of a menial mentality, this servile eagerness to pass for broad-minded types in the eyes of some visiting third-rate foreigner? Sometimes, to earn a condescending pat on the head and a high-handed "okay," we are prepared to retreat before those who, while demanding that we abandon our ideological fixation, have themselves not retreated one millimeter from their own ideology, but are skillfully defending it. Yet an elementary sense of dignity along should warn us: People will simply stop respecting us, and not only as opponents, but even as equal colleagues. We must speak of this out loud because openness must be of equivalent force everywhere and for everyone.

Unfortunately, it is sometimes selective. For instance, every writer from any republic has the natural right to confess his love for his people, for his roots. And that is a fine thing, since our Soviet patriotism grows not by hydrophonics, but in real national soil. Yet when a Russian colleague of ours worships his native land with the same natural, filial love, frequently there are whispers and hits of all kinds of great-power- and just plain power-"isms." Why, comrades? Who gave us the right to doubt the internationalism of the great people who, in their selfless generosity, helped many peoples, after October, to acquire a written language and organize an academy in every republic, while not having one of its own, through modesty, to this very day?

On the basis of the same stereotype which someone or other has imposed, the Ukrainian's natural desire to develop his native tongue arouses an almost traditional reaction: "Oh, here were go again!", followed by the traditional term. Yet Lenin, in the "Resolution of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee on Soviet Power in the Ukraine," regarded the Ukrainian language as a most important means of communist education of the working masses, and called for every possible resistance to attempts to push it into the background.

Yet meanwhile, in some of our oblast centers, the number of Ukrainian schools is approaching zero. This, of course, is nobody's fault but our own... Although you know very well to whom our enemies attribute these mistakes. And therefore we ask our Russian brothers to help us to impose Leninist orders in this sphere too. As for the Russian language, we simply cannot conceive of ourselves without it. It gives us the opportunity to have contact and learn about each other in our multinational fatherland. Therefore we cherish it from childhood, like our mother tongue.

All these problems should be made public, and I address this appeal above all to the central press, which sometimes tries to avoid them. For some months now, for instance, I have not been able to make my way into its pages on the subject of the Chernobyl AES, where it is proposed (or by now, they say, has been proposed) to build the third phase. Today, on the sorrowful anniversary, more than ever before we should give deep thought to this: Have we considered everything before taking this risky step?

By the sacred laws of "family feeling," we are mutually accountable. We bear equal measures of responsibility for our own people and for every people living under the skies of Leninist fraternity. Thus we have been taught by the life of all 70 years since October. Thus we have been raised by our Soviet multinational literature!

Zalygin: 'Questions' To Raise

PM081250 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 4

[Abbreviated account of speech delivered by Sergey Zalygin (Moscow) at 27-28 April USSR Writers' Union Board Plenum]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] I have heard the following reproach and wish expressed in relation to LITERATURNAYA GAZETA -- let us replace them all: They have been working there too long. I am not against changes, but I am in favor of approaching this matter very cautiously. It can happen that we want to do better, but actually do worse. This must be given very serious thought.

The second point is this. Some of our colleagues were at one time expelled from the union. That is what happened to our people. Kornilov, as well as others. They were expelled, because they once permitted themselves to say what we now say without formality. It is necessary to approach this problem very thoughtfully, treating each case individually. Otherwise, what kind of a union do we have, if it is indifferent to what happens to us, whom we accept, whom we do not accept, whom we expelled, whom we must reinstate.

This question must be raised at a bureau meeting. One way or another, we must not forget these people.

I would like to speak very briefly on the problem of internationalism. I think, in general, this is a very serious problem. It is not the same anywhere else as it is for us, because we have a union of republics and we have very important links with each other. We often forget that our links and our relations are so important. So each national cultural initiative must be everyone's cause, an international cause.

If we can learn to approach our problems with that yardstick, we will resolve many questions, and if not, we can expect very great material losses, not to mention the moral losses.

Our union holds a very important place in the country's cultural life, so let us hold that place with dignity.

Mikhaylov Criticizes Paper

PM071536 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 3

[Abbreviated account of speech delivered by Aleksandr Mikhaylov (Moscow) at 27-28 April USSR Writers' Union Board Plenum]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] I would like to speak particularly about LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. Here we can see efforts toward restructuring, only efforts. Debate after debate occurs. Sometimes there is a glimmer of something relevant and businesslike. Of the polemical articles, one can single out N. Ivanova's article "Responsibility Is Equal," in which the author speaks frankly, and almost for the first time in our country, of the reader's consumerist attitude to literature. Indeed, there has been enough flirting with the reader and idealizing him; he "varies on inspection" -- it was Tvardovskiy who said that. But we had forgotten. The dialogue between T. Glushkova and L. Anninskiy is serious.

In the debate "Poetry: Face to Face With the Reader," the young poet V. Korkiya wrote a fervent article. The article contains much that is debatable, and V. Kurbatov is correct when he says, in the same debate: "...It becomes increasingly difficult to listen to them (the young -- A.M.)."

Let me explain why. Because sincere discussion is distorted by bravado and arrogance. That is nothing but a response to the arrogance of the older generation, who peremptorily alienate them from poetry.

This debate was launched, but where is the continuation?

LITERATURNAYA GAZETA is weak on the standard of debate, it conducts debates in the olk way, and so some of them crumble into dust. They propose, for instance, a poll: "When and how did you sense and become aware of the birth of the poetic gift in yourself?". This question leaves the poets floundering. Rasul Gamzatov replies: "Whatever answer I give... it will be frivolous." Others reply in the same vein. Here is a question which already contains the answer: "Is it true, in your opinion, that poetry, to regain its former popularity and effectiveness, must change?..." You will agree there is nothing here to discuss.

Let me be frank: As yet, one can hardly expect a resolute restructuring from LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. The workers who head the editorial board have been at their posts for 20 years or more. They have exhausted themselves in this work, and however much they may wish to, they cannot restructure themselves psychologically. It would be sensible and humane to give them the opportunity to display their capabilities in another area of activity, and radically renew the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA leadership. I think the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA leaders should be the first to understand that, and for their own benefit.

Of course, I do not want to blame LITERATURNAYA GAZETA for the shortcomings of criticism. Criticism is rightly reproached for the weakness of its theoretical basis. We are thinking about this and preparing a plenum of the council on questions of the theory and methodology of critical analysis, on methodological problems.

Of course, it is not a matter of the mechanical assimilation of social criteria. V. Lukyanin, a reputable critic, yielded to inertia: He counted up the number of articles and reviews -- a total of 61 -- and announced in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA that they did not contain a single mention of socialist realism. [paragraph continues]

The other day I was sent a newspaper from Rostov containing a critique of V. Likhonosov's new novel "Unwritten Memoirs" ["Nenapisannyye Vospominaniya"]. Let me quote a paragraph: "It would be groundless to claim this is a truth about life which the writer has a right to depicit. There have been such episodes in life. But under the laws of the method of socialist realism, the writer must depict typical characters and typical circumstances. The reader should learn lessons from tragedy, he should gain moral strength. Tragedy should be optimistic."

Does such a reference make things easier?

Theory is the basis, the methodological foundation of criticism, not an addendum to it. [passage omitted]

Prokhanov: 'Negative Culture'

PM081054 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 4

[Abbreviated account of speech delivered by Aleksandr Prokhanov (Moscow) at 27-28 April USSR Writers' Union Board Plenum]

[Text] "Negative culture," "negative thinking" -- that is what we are confronting in the period of openness, when all the bottles have been uncorked and all the jinns have flown to freedom. Brilliant current affairs writers, sophisticated cinematographers, venerable literary men -- they have all joined in the work of destruction, covering ideology, art, and social relations. This "negative culture" is well organized, operates in a well synchronized way, attacks its targets according to a plan, and many of these targets have been razed to the ground. This work is useful at a time when there is much rotten and dead in nature, when the fallen leaves from an entire period of our national history are decaying.

This avenue, the most active today, considers itself the vanguard of the restructuring, its design bureau. It is not neutral with regard to other trends which were so strong until recently. It is repressive with regard to many of them. Repressive criticism. Repressive public discrediting. Repressive attacks on structures, with a view to occupying more positions. There has been much success here.

But if this trend is victorious, if its proposed forms and methods are victorious, we will confront a situation which is already full predictable today.

If its desire to dominate is fulfilled, the parliamentary balance of forces is violated, and the conciliatory principle is removed, this will lead to the total rebuttal of those cultural groups which are far from weak, which are highly equipped and are prepared to unite in the face of this destructive attack, in the face of the threat of a new cultural dictatorship. It is a question of a possible cultural split and the ensuing draining of creative energy at a time when that energy is so badly needed by the country.

There is another prediction one can make today. The restructuring is in its earliest, most naive phase. The seeds sown in the economy, the social sphere, and international politics are only just beginning to swell. How will they grow? What kind of shoots will they produce? In a few years the roots of the restructuring will begin to move and put forth shoots, and a large number of the most unexpected phenomena will begin to spring up and develop. We passionately believe in its blossoming. [paragrapah continues]

But failures and disruptions are possible. In the economy, in social practice, in international affairs. There may be the pain, the torment, and the sacrifices of restructuring. Then culture must relate to the real, largely unpredictable restructuring. The zeal for "negative culture," which demands more and more new objects to negate, more and more fuel to keep the negative machine going — this zeal will place culture in a new relation. The roles of groups and ways of thinking will change often and repeatedly. Thinkers who harbor the idea of civic stoicism, civic sacrifice, could be needed more and more.

What are the areas of philosophy where the polemics will develop?

These areas will develop around the problems of peace, fending off catastrophe and achieving compromise between the two superstructures. Here the view of the army, of the defense mentality, as the main obstacle to the attainment of "earthly paradise" is beginning to openly assert itself. The formulas proposed by so-called "superliterature" demand the immediate dismantling of the world military structure without the participation of those who created it, who know how it is organized, who control it and have pinned their philosophy on it. Military civilization, the bunker in whose depths we live, demands an all-round, multifaceted approach with the participation of all who inhabit it, including, of course, the people of culture, with their humanitarian approach. But the claim to omniscience, humanitarian aggressiveness regarding the people of defense and the army which won us sovereignty and 40 years of postwar peace, is at best a polemical naivete, and at worst a desire to destroy yet another of the foundations on which the state is built. Conducting a serious analysis of defense problems, descending into the missile silos and submarine compartments, being present in the "Afghan theater of hostilities" -- without this, the artist will not be able to create a working model of security.

The salvation of nature from civilization and technology. The separation of the problem of nature from the problem of civilization. The transformation of nature into a reserve and the anathematization of everything that consists of wheels, coaches, and fireboxes. Literature has taken a firm hold on this position, and we will not see very soon any books about factories, railroads, or the breakthrough in overcoming technological laggardness. The restructuring, which presupposes, among other things, the mighty development of industry and its transformation into an intelligently controlled geological force, will have difficulty in drawing on writers with a knowledge of machines in our culture, but will find plenty of writers belonging to the Young Naturalists. The philosophical interpretation of the humanized, animated technology that operates in nature. Nature which is preserved from destruction by that same civilization. The creation of an indissoluble creative unit: man, nature, technology. That is what our thinkers should be working on, if they do not want to find themselves in opposition to the future.

Our attitude to the past and the future is another torment. We have now turned, in a body, to the past. The recent, distant, and ancient past. The past is our teacher. But how are we to deal with the assertion that the world has entered a new, nonclassical period, where classical forms do not operate, classical approaches do not work, where new insights and improvisations, a break with triviality, are needed? This duality in the consciousness of the people of culture gives a certain color to the very idea of the restructuring, its motives and its goals.

There is a view, a fairly widespread view, that the restructuring was supposedly detonated by the USSR's strategic lag behind Western civilization.

Soviet hospitals provide worse treatment than Western ones. Soviet computers calculate slower than Western ones. This lag, which is fatal to defense, social development, and all national life, has forced us into the restructuring. Its purpose and task is to catch up with the West, to follow in its wake and reduce the distance. This view of "pursuit restructuring" places us in the tail of Western civilization and makes us imitate its example, whether in instruments, rock groups, interviewing methods, or management and economic models. This kind of imitation deprives us of our sovereign path, gives us an inferiority complex, and offers to the unique society which has chosen socialism trivial paths and plans which condemn us to despondency. Culture cannot tolerate this.

The restructuring, taking place in an atmosphere of spiritual freedom and open intellectual quest, presupposes an explosion of new ideas, original scientific and social concepts, the birth of economic and social schools incorporating the flower of science, the people's intellectual potential, which is capable of formulating its own strategic goals for development rather than copying them from elsewhere, and the attainment of these goals by original, sovereign means based on the ideal of the socialist society, socialist man, socialist culture. This program will require from the people the same efforts once required by our nuclear and missile programs, the same concentration and speed. A powerful turn toward the future — that is the urgent requirement for culture.

The position of writers in society today is unique. They have proved to be the most mobile milieu, not hemmed in by the old monoliths, capable of expressing ideas independently so the people hear, so the structures hear. Literature is the screen on which many original ideas which have accumulated among the people can appear. Shame on us if that screen is clouded by continual interference arising from our infighting, if we use openness to display the seamy side of literature.

In our disagreements, in our polemics, which are inevitable in lively development, we are a part of the people's self-awareness, their aspirations toward the ideal, the good. Let us serve these goals.

DEPUTY PROSECUTOR S.A. SHISHKOV DIES

PM081025 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 May 87 Morning Edition p 6

[Obituary of S.A. Shishkov]

[Excerpts] Sergey Aleksandrovich Shishkov, USSR deputy general prosecutor, died 30 April 1987 after a serious illness.

S.A. Shishkov was born 2 October 1923 in the village of Semenovskaya, Mozhayskiy Rayon, Moscow Oblast, in a worker family. [passage omitted]

A.I. Lukyanov, N.I. Savinkin, M.S. Smirtyukov, A.M. Rekunkov, B.V. Kravtsov, V.I. Terebilov, A.V. Vlasov, T.N. Menteshashvili, V.A. Abolentsev, A.N. Soshnikov, P.Ya. Slezko, A.S. Pavlov, V.V. Naydenov, N.A. Bazhenov, P.G. Mishunin, O.V. Soroka, I.V. Chermenskiy, A.Ya. Sukharev, S.A. Yemelyanov, A.A. Rozanov.

REPORTAGE OF VICTORY DAY ANNIVERSARY OBSERVANCE

Sokolov Article

PM110945 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 May 87 First Edition p 2

[Article by USSR Minister of Defense Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov: "Victory for the Sake of Peace"]

[Text] Today is the 42d anniversary of the victory in the Great Patriotic War. Together with Soviet people this great and joyful holiday is being celebrated by the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries and all progressive mankind. In our country it is taking place in an atmosphere of vigorous nationwide work on the fulfillment of the decisions of the 27th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum and preparation for a fitting greeting to the 70th anniversary of Great October. Restructuring is gathering momentum and the revolutionary renewal of all aspects of our society's life is under way.

I.

The path to victory in the Great Patriotic War was harsh and difficult. The gigantic struggle between the Soviet people and their armed forces and Hitler's war machine lasted nearly 4 years.

On 22 June 1941 fascist Germany together with its satellites delivered a perfidious strike of enormous force against the Soviet Union. The invasion army numbered 190 divisions, 5.5 million men, about 4,300 tanks, over 47,000 guns and mortars, and nearly 5,000 combat aircraft. In elaborating plans for gaining world rule, Hitler's leadership viewed the USSR as the main obstacle on the path to this goal and set the task of destroying our state and enslaving the Soviet people. Before attacking the Soviet Union German fascism had occupied a number of European countries and used their economy in preparing aggression against the East. The enemy's enormous military-economic potential was twice the potential of the USSR. The German fascist troops had combat experience acquired in nearly 2 years during which they had been waging combat operations.

All this predetermined the exceptionally tense nature of the fighting launched in the very first days of the Great Patriotic War on the entire length of the Soviet-German front -- from the Barents Sea to the Black Sea. The aggressor met with fierce resistance on Soviet soil. The border troops, ground forces, armored and artillery forces, airmen and seamen, and all servicemen who took the strike of the fascist army displayed fearlessness and valor. They fought courageously on every frontier, for every inch of their native land, and caused enormous damage to the enemy. But the enemy had on his side the advantages of a surprise attack and long preparation for a predatory war. Our omissions in preparing to repel the aggressor's first strikes also had an effect. That is why our troops were obliged, with the hard, bloody fighting to retreat deep into the country's interior.

The entire Soviet people rose to the struggle aganst the German fascist invaders. At the party's call "everything for the front, everything for victory!" the country rallied into a single war camp. The selfless support from the rear services lent firmness to the front. In the border fighting, in the heroic defense of Leningrad, Kiev, Odessa, and Sevastopol, in the fighting at Smolensk, Hitler's blitzkrieg plan ws thwarted and in the battle at Moscow it was definitively buried. As G.K. Zhukov later recalled, it was here that the crack fascist troops were dashed against the iron staunchness, courage, and heroism of the Soviet troops.

In the hard days of the war our people's supreme morale was manifested in all its strength. Boundless faith in Victory, in Lenin's party, and in the justice and correctness of the cause of socialism led Soviet people to a military and labor exploit. Their mass heroism at the front and in the rear delighted the whole world and inspired the peoples of other countries to the struggle against fascism.

The crushing strikes against the enemy in the fighting at Stalingrad and Kursk and on the Dnepr led to a fundamental breakthrough in the Great Patriotic War and all World War II. Our troops shifted to the offensive on the entire Soviet-German front and drove the fascist invaders from the territory of the USSR. They also honorably fulfilled their great liberation mission, bringing the European peoples salvation from the fascist yoke.

In May of the victorious year of 1945 the war in Europe ended. The main seat of aggression from which it had begun had been eliminated. In that same year the USSR, loyal to its ally commitments, entered the war against Japan and defeated the 1 million-strong Kwantung army. World War II ended with the capitulation of militarist Japan.

The victory in this war became a common gain for all those who had fought the aggressors. Soviet people pay a tribute of respect and gratitude to the peoples and armies of the United States, Britain, France, China, and other states of the anti-Hitler coalition and to the partisans, resistance movement fighters, antifascists, democrats and patriots, and millions of freedom fighters. The Yugoslav people and their national liberation army displayed staunchness and courage in the struggle against fascism. With the Red Army the Polish Army and the Czechoslovak Army and, at the concluding stage of the war, the armies of Bulgaria and Romania and Hungarian military units fought the Hitlerite invaders. In the fighting against the common enemy a combat community of fraternal armies was born which has strengthened considerably with the years and now reliably stands guard over socialist gains.

The main brunt of the struggle against German fascism lay on our country and on the Soviet Armed Forces. Their contribution to the defeat of the aggressor was a determining one. To an enormous extent mankind is indebted to the USSR for its salvation from the threat of fascist enslavement and for its freedom. Reactionary propaganda in the West is doing everything to belittle the magnitude of the Soviet people's patriotic and international exploit. But it cannot refute the fact that before our country entered the war not one of the European states subjected to attack was able to deliver a proper rebuff to fascist aggression. It was on the Soviet-German front that the myth of the invincibility of Hitler's wehrmacht was dispelled. It was here that 607 divisions were defeated — a little over three times more than on all other fronts. And it was the Soviet troops which took Berlin, the headquarters of Hitler's supreme command, and captured the enemy's largest groupings.

Our victory was a victory for the multinational Soviet people who defended their freedom and independence and precious Soviet power.

Our victory was a natural victory for the most progressive social system -- socialism — and its economy, ideology, and morality.

Our victory was a victory for the socialist army, an army of a new type, for Soviet military science and military art, and the strategic leadership and martial skill of our military cadres.

Lenin's Communist Party was the inspirer and organizer of all the victories and accomplishments of the Soviet people and their Armed Forces. [paragraph continues]

It ensured the firm unity of political, state, and military leadership, and rallied the front and rear and the army and people. The Communists were on the hardest and most crucial sectors of the struggle against the enemy and by their personal example of selflessness and heroism led the Soviet people to their great common goal -- victory.

As a result of the defeat of the most reactionary shock forces of imperialism the Soviet Union's international prestige strengthened still further. The new social system was victorious in a number of European and Asian countries. The community of socialist states was formed. The colonial system disintegrated. All this led to the narrowing of the sphere of imperialism's rule and to a fundamental change in the correlation of forces in the international arena in favor of the peoples struggling for social progress, democracy, national freedom, and peace. Favorable preconditions emerged for preventing imperialism's attempts to dictate its will to other states and peoples with impunity. A real prospect was opened up for establishing lasting peace on earth.

II.

The results of World War II did not suit international imperialism. Soon after the victory, the U.S. ruling circles, possessing a monopoly on nuclear weapons, launched preparations for war against the USSR. It renounced the political and economic cooperation with the Soviet Union which had been carried out in the years of the joint struggle against fascism in the framework of the anti-Hitlerite coalition. The United States effected an abrupt turnaround toward confrontation and began the anti-Soviet, antisocialist "Cold War" and a race for nuclear and other arms.

Today, through the fault of imperialism, the international situation is alarming and dangerous. Implementing more and more new militarist programs, the United States is gambling particularly on SDI with whose implementation are linked hopes for achieving military superiority over the USSR. Aggressive military doctrines and concepts are being worked out which envisage the unleasing and waging of global and "limited" nuclear and conventional wars against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. West German revanchism and Japanese militarism which are fighting to smash the territorial and political realities which have taken shape as a result of the Victory, are raising their heads with the support of the imperialist reaction.

The adventurist policy of imperialism which threatens mankind with nuclear catastrophe is being countered by the peace-loving course of the USSR and of the whole socialist community. The lessons of the last war are taken into account in this course. The most important of these lessons is that it is necessary to struggle against war before it has even begun. In the thirties it proved impossible to avert a world war through the fault of the Western powers which refused to support the Soviet proposals for organizing a joint rebuff to the aggressor because they were counting on destroying socialism with the aid of the fascist war machine. And only in the course of the war, when faced with the mounting threat of fascist enslavement, were they forced to pool their efforts with the USSR in the struggle against the aggressors.

The creation of the anti-Hitlerite coalition provided valuable experience of cooperation between states of opposed systems and of the joint search for and implementation of mutually acceptable decisions and effective actions for the sake of establishing peace. Unfortunately, in the postward period our former allies rejected this experience. The contemporary situation shows with particular cogency its significance and dictates the need for great vigilance by the peoples and for energetic action by all peace-loving forces against the aggressive, adventurist course of the reactionary circles which are nudging the world toward war, but this time an immeasurably more devastating war -- a nuclear war. The unleashing of such a war is tantamount to self-destruction, and will lead to mankind's perishing.

A world war in the nuclear and space age is something obsolete and has ceased to be a means of achieving political goals. Contentious problems, even the most acute and difficult, can and must be resolved only around the negotiating table. A realization of this, a realization of the need to renounce wars and strong-arm policy in international affairs constitute the essence of the new political thinking and of the new approaches to questions of war and peace. The way of thinking and acting based on the concept of "nuclear deterrence" is now unacceptable. The continuation of the arms race is senseless and extremely dangerous. By building up military preparations, the United States is counting on achieving superiority over the USSR. Clearly the USSR will not permit this. "...The Soviet Union does not lay claim to greater security, and will not settle for less security," M.S. Gorbachev declared in the Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress. Any attempt to disrupt the existing military equilibrium will be negated. The necessary response will be found even if a threat to the USSR and the socialist community should appear from space.

But this is not something of our choosing. We are against rivalry in arms and against the expenditure of effort and money which leads to the undermining of international security and to increasingly unpredictable war-brinkmanship.

The USSR regards the struggle against the threat of nuclear catastrophe as a most important task. The Soviet program for a nuclear-free world put forward in January 1986, the comprehensive system of international security worked out by the 27th CPSU Congress, the radical proposals at Reykjavik, and other peace-loving steps by the USSR are aimed at solving this task.

Great opportunities for starting real disarmament and for a decisive change for the better in international relations are revealed by the initiatives recently put forward by the Soviet Union for eliminating medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe given the establishment of the strictest system of verifying compliance with the pledges adopted by the sides on this score, and also by the initiatives on questions of reducing tactical nuclear means, armed forces, and conventional arms in Europe. Moreover, the Soviet Union has proposed that key provisions be worked out for reducing strategic offensive arms and for preventing the militarization of space, and also on talks on banning all nuclear tests.

The Soviet initiatives are an expression of the USSR's good will and of its firm determination to safeguard the most precious thing which Victory gave us — universal peace.

III.

The USSR has been forced to combine its peace-loving policy with constant concern to ensure the reliable defense of socialism's gains. The need for such defense stems from the lessons of the Great Patriotic War and of the contemporary situation in the world. As long as international reaction spurs on the arms race, as long as it does not renounce a policy of social revenge and "crusades" against socialism, says the CPSU Central Committee Address to the Soviet People in connection with the 70th anniversary of Great October, the CPSU and Soviet state will do everything necessary to maintain the defensive might of our country and of the socialist community at the due level.

The USSR Armed Forces stand guard over the peaceful labor of the Soviet people. The development and improvement of these forces is being carried out along the same channel as our state-wide building and in strict conformity with the defensive nature of Soviet military doctrine while combat readiness is being maintained at a level which will guarantee that aggression, wheresoever it may originate, will be successfully repulsed.

The labor of military cadres and of the entire personnel of the Army and Navy is aimed at the unswerving enhancement of combat readiness. The restructuring currently taking place in the Armed Forces which embraces all aspects of their life and activity is also aimed at this.

Fulfilling the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, Soviet servicemen are focusing their efforts on the enhancement of the quality of combat and political training and of the proficiency of units in the field and in the air, and of the seamanship of the fleets. Manifestations of formalism, indulgence, and oversimplification in combat training and service are being eradicated. The effectiveness of party-political work is being enhanced and its influence on the successful solution of training and combat tasks is being intensified. Unremitting attention is being paid in the Army and Navy to the improvement of the level of morale and aggressiveness [moralno-boyevyye kachestva], the strengthening of military discipline of the personnel, and the maintenance of firm regulation order in units and on the ships. The creative use of our priceless asset -- the combat experience of the last war -- plays an important role in solving these tasks.

The heroic chronicle of the Great Patriotic War attests to the high combat skill and unbending morale of the Soviet servicemen.

Staunchness and courage, valor and fearlessness, the ability to struggle successfully against a highly trained adversary, skilled mastery of weapons and equipment, and a will for victory are all qualities which were inherent in the older generation of soldiers and officers and which are being inculcated into the present generation.

The organizational and educational activity of the commanders and political workers of the period of the Great Patriotic War such as L. Dovator, I. Panfilov, A. Pokryshkin, M. Gadzhiyev, V. Klochkov, A. Pankratov, and thousands and thousands of other generals and officers, are an instructive example for our military cadres. They skillfully trained subunits and units for military action, controlled these actions expertly, were close to their subordinates, took a paternal interest in their welfare, and shared with them all the hardships of life at the front. Everything of the best from their experience finds application in the training and combat practice of today's officers.

Soviet servicemen are proud of the fact that they are trusted to serve under combat banners which have been covered in the glory of victories. They treasure this lofty honor and are persistently augmenting the traditions of unshakable loyalty to the military oath and military duty. In a fight with Afghan dushmans, Guard Private First Class A. Koryavin used his own body to shield his commander from an enemy bullet. He, like Privates A. Matrosov, Yu. Smirnov, and other heroes of the last war, has been entered for eternity in the roll of the military unit in which he performed his immortal feat.

In the combat formation of the Armed Forces the sons of all nations and ethnic groups of our motherland serve shoulder to shoulder. They live as a single combat family. A profound awareness of their patriotic and internationalist duty unites them and strengthens the bonds of military comradeship. Service in the Army and Navy demands of a serviceman firm ideological conviction, diverse knowledge, ingrained skills, and robust physical fitness. The foundations of these qualities are laid even when preparing for military service. A detailed discussion about improving this preparation and about the military-patriotic education of young people took place at the recent 20th Komsomol Congress. Commanders, political organs, and party and Komsomol organizations of the Army and Navy must render the Soviets, schools, vocational and technical schools, and labor collectives more active and concrete assistance in solving this task. [paragraph continues]

Much is being done and even more can be done by those who have gone through the great school of military service -- the servicemen of the reserve, and above all, those who have battle experience.

Veterans of the Great Patriotic War have a special role to play in the military-patriotic education of young people. Their words and advice, backed up by their example in life find fertile soil in young hearts. Communion with veterans aids the civic development and moral maturation of young people and prompts them to nurture in themselves even more persistently a high sense of responsibility for the destiny of the motherland and readiness to defend it selflessly.

Victory in the Great Patriotic War which was gained for the sake of peace, lives on in today's patriotic deeds and achievements of our country's working people. The intentions of Soviet people are linked not with war but with peace, with creative labor. But the stern reality of our time is such that it is necessary to struggle for peace. It needs defending against the military adventures and intrigues of imperialism. This task is being worthily fulfilled by the Soviet Armed Forces together with the fraternal armies of the Warsaw Pact member states. They are vigilantly standing guard over the motherland and the gains of socialism, and are reliably safeguarding peace on earth.

Lushev Address

LD091032 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0645 GMT 9 May 87

[Address by Army General Petr Georgiyevich Lushev, USSR first deputy minister of defense, on World War II Victory Day -- live or recorded]

[Text] Comrades, the Great Patriotic War ended 42 years ago. That day in May, 1945, has forever entered the consciousness of the Soviet people and the whole of progressive mankind as a symbol of the invincibility of socialism. And the more time goes by, the more clearly and in greater relief the greatness of the Soviet people's feat appears to the world.

The last war has entered the history of our homeland as the Great Patriotic War, as a war of liberation, a just war. In crushing the aggressor, the Soviet people and its armed forces under the leadership of the Communist Party defended the cause of October, liberated the peoples of many European countries from the fascist yoke and carried out with honor their patriotic and internationalist duty.

The war was a severe test for the Soviet people. It is difficult for the present generation to imagine the scale of that battle, one of the greatest in history, which lasted 1,418 days and nights of fire and which included innumerable feats at the front and in the rear. Combat operations took place on a vast front from the Barents Sea to the Black Sea. The fascists had superiority in numbers and seized the strategic initiative. They rushed eastwards deep into Soviet territory.

The aggressors imagined they would gain a rapid victory, but the enemy celebrated too soon. The Soviet troops conducted an active defense. They checked the aggressor's offensive onslaught. They pulverized the crack fascist divisions. With unparalleled staunchness and courage they defended every inch of Soviet territory. The enemy increasingly felt the growing strength of resistance. At the end of 1941, in the Battle of Moscow, the myth of the invincibility of the fascist army was dispelled.

In order to repell the invasion and rout the enemy, the Communist Party in a short time mobilised the whole strength of our people, put the economy on a war footing, and turned the country into a single military camp. Relying on the support of our whole people, the Soviet Army achieved a change in its favor in the correlation of forces. It went over to a resolute attack and inflicted shattering blows, expelling the Hitlerite aggressors from the territory of the USSR and a number of East European countries.

The Berlin operation was a triumph of Soviet military art and the military skill of our troops. During this a million-strong grouping of the enemy was smashed. Fascist Germany was overthrown and its army totally routed.

The victory was forged at the front and in the rear. In the battles against the Hitlerite aggressors, the commanders, political workers and fighting men displayed bravery and heroism, military skill and a high moral and political spirit. Over 11,000 men of the Army and Navy were awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union, the highest degree of combat distinction. Orders and medals were awarded to over 7 million people.

The victory over fascist Germany and then the routing of Japanese militarism convincingly showed to the whole world the unconquerable might of the Soviet people. This was and still remains a subject for great pride and optimism for us; it serves as a severe warning to any aggressor.

Mass heroism was shown by the workers in the rear, the working class, kolkhoz farm peasantry, the intelligentsia, women, and young people.

They did not go into the attack, but every day they worked selflessly for the front. Their work in the fields and in the factories provided the bread and the weapons for victory.

The victory of the Soviet Union and the defeat of the forces of fascism and aggression were historically determined by the entire progress of development of the Soviet state, by the objective capabilities inherent in the very nature of socialism. In a war lasting many years, the socialist social and state system demonstrated its vitality and its indisputable superiority over the capitalist system in the areas of the economy, politics, and ideology. With less industrial potential than the enemy, the socialist economy ensured that our armed forces gained superiority in equipment over the enemy and provided all that was necessary for the successful conduct of the war.

The struggle against the imperialist invaders was led by the Communist Party, which stepped forward as a collective leader and military commander which knew how to direct all the country's resources, the energy and titanic strength of the party of Lenin, the power of its ideas, the wisdom of its policies, and its role as organizer and inspirer emerged even more clearly. In its foreign policy activity, the Party of Lenin manifested the utmost flexibility and profound foresight, which made it possible to wreck attempts by reactionary forces to establish a unified anti-Soviet front, and fostered the creation and consolidation of the anti-Hitler coalition.

The rout of fascism was achieved by the joint efforts of the peoples of many states. We give due appreciation to their role. At the same time, it is historically beyond dispute that in this joint struggle the Soviet Union was the main force blocking Hitlerite Germany's road to world domination. It was the Soviet people and their armed forces who made the decisive contribution to victory over Hitlerite Germany, to the liberation of the peoples of Europe from fascist slavery, and to the deliverance of world civilization. That was their greatest service to mankind.

In spite of the stern lessons of history, the aggressive imperialist circles of the United States and other NATO countries have not renounced their adventurist designs to crush socialism by force of arms. This makes it incumbent upon the Soviet Union to do all that is necessary to make itself and its allies secure against sudden aggression. Thanks to the tireless concern of the CPSU over strengthening the country's defenses, and thanks to the selfless work of our people, military-strategical parity has come about between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

This has still further strengthened the positions of the Soviet Union, the countries of socialism, and of all progressive forces, and has overturned the expectations of the aggressive circles of imperialism of victory in war.

Nonetheless, the world situation remains complex and tense. Reactionary U.S. forces are striving to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union at all costs, and to dictate their will to other states and peoples. Openly gambling on military force, the United States is continuing to step up the arms race. It places special emphasis on long-term programs to improve its land-, sea-, and air-borne nuclear missile forces. A large-scale program of preparing for and waging chemical and biological warfare is being implemented. Work related to the creation of weapons based on new principles of physics is being stepped up.

A great danger to the cause of peace is presented by U.S. plans to militarize space. "Star Wars" plans are an attempt to acquire the capability to deliver a nuclear blow at the Soviet Union with impunity, sheltering from retribution behind an antimissile space shield.

Adventurism and readiness to put at risk the vital interests of mankind in the name of attaining the anti-people's selfish aims of capitalist monopolies are the distinguishing features of the foreign policy of the militant circles of U.S. imperialism.

Glancing back mentally to the events of World War II and its lasting lessons, we know that you have to fight against war before it starts. The tireless struggle for peace and to curb the arms race is a main direction of the foreign policy activity of the Soviet Union. From the first act of legislation, Lenin's Decree on Peace, our state has persistently and consistenly advocated the prevention of wars.

The Soviet people believe in the triumph of reason and of the new way of political thinking, they believe that the policy of detente and peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems are to be the basis of their relations, and they believe in ridding mankind of the nuclear threat. The USSR's new peace initiatives in the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons stand for a real prospect of building a nuclear-free world. It is time for the United States and its NATO partners to recognize that in the nuclear age the only way to real national security is through reduction in the level of military confrontation -- the reduction and, in the final analysis, the total abolition of nuclear and other kinds of weapons of mass destruction.

Memory is a priceless possession. Today we are recalling the Great Patriotic War so that we might realize once again just how great is the treachery of imperialism. That is why, while putting forward innovative ideas and constructive proposals, intended to ensure security and cooperation among peoples, we are under no illusions: taking into account the tension in the international situation and the aspiration of U.S. aggressive circles for world domination, the CPSU takes all necessary measures to strengthen the country's defense capability.

And the defense might of the USSR, as Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed at the 27th party Congress, is being maintained at a level which enables it reliably to defend the peaceful labor and peaceful lives of Soviet people.

Restructuring is now actively under way in the Soviet Armed Forces, just as in all of our society. It finds embodiment in an improvement in the quality of field, air and naval training and in a strengthening of party influence over all aspects of the lives of military collectives. Everything is being done to make the combat potential of the Army and Navy an enduring fusion of military skill, a high degree of technical equipment, ideological resolve, organization and the discipline of the personel, and their loyalty to patriotic and internationalist duty.

The present defenders of the socialist homeland are true to the combat traditions of the Soviet Armed Forces. The courage, valor and bravery of Soviet servicemen on the soil of Afghanistan and in eliminating the consequences of the accident at Chernobyl are convincing confirmation of that. Soviet servicemen are carrying out their sacred duty to defend the gains of socialism alongside the servicemen of the armies of the Warsaw Pact countries. They counter the aggressive plans of reactionary circles of imperialism with restraint, vigilence, and a high degree of combat readiness. And the more solid the friendship between the peoples and the armies of the socialist countries, the more safe is the cause of defending socialism and peace on earth.

Marking Victory Day, we pay tribute to the memory of the courageous sons and daughters of our homeland who fell in battles for freedom and the independence of the homeland. We celebrate the veterans of war and labor. The years, decades, and centuries go by, but the feat of the Land of the Soviets and its valiant Armed Forces in saving mankind from the brown plague of fascism will never be erased from the memory of the peoples. The peace in which we now live has been won at great cost. The peoples must remember that and always struggle actively for a peaceful future and the preservation of life on our earth.

Permit me to congratulate cordially participants in the war and veterans of labor, servicemen in the Army and Navy and all working people on the great holiday, Victory Day.

Tretyak Interview

LD071159 Moscow TASS in English 1119 GMT 7 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 7 TASS -- A TASS correspondent writes:

"I hate war," said Ivan Tretyak, deputy minister of defence of the USSR. The 64-year-old general of the Army gave an interview to a TASS correspondent on the eve of May 9, the day of the victory over Nazi Germany.

The general who had gone to the front at the age of 17 and saw its end at the age of 22 in the rank of lieutenant-colonel and was awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union, the general is still young-looking and braced now, 42 years after the victorious assault of the Reichstag.

"War is a sea of blood and sweat. At times it brings with it irreversible changes in the state of mind of people who did not endure the tremendous stress," he said. "My war buddies and I cursed the war even when we were receiving combat awards."

Is it, maybe, better not to recall the war, as is being suggested in the West increasingly often?

"Unfortunately, in some countries such wishes already bear fruit," the deputy minister said in answer to this question.

"Owing to 'forgetful' historians, wars are portrayed in the imagination of portion of young people as some adventures by superman soldiers. This plays into the hands of the apologists of a new war."

"Many in the West have, possibly, heard about such places of Nazi atrocities as Babiy Yar and Khatyn. But not everyone knows, for example, about children's concentration camps which were set up by the Nazis on the territory of Belorussia, Latvia and in other areas. Many dozens of thousands of orphans, widows, children, women and old men tortured to death, and the ruins of towns -- all that should serve as a constant warning to mankind."

The conversation turns to the Soviet Union's allies for the anti-Hitler coalition.

"We do not forget the material assistance rendered to us by the allies. It was substantial, although not so great as some people in the West want to describe it," General Tretyak observed.

"Some bourgeois historians exaggerate the role of the allies and belittle the role of the Soviet Union in the defeat of the common enemy. But it is a matter of common knowledge that the second front in Europe opened only when it became obvious that the Red Army could well rout the Nazis single-handed. Following the opening of the second front, the Soviet-German front still remained the main one."

And the concluding question about Soviet military policy. In answer to this question the general mentioned the Soviet Union's obligations not to be the first to use nuclear weapons or to orbit them.

He recalled the announcement of the Soviet moratorium on further deployment of medium-range missiles in the European part of the USSR, the removal of part of missiles from operational duty, and the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests.

"None of these steps were supported by the United States and its allies," Ivan Tretyak said. "The facts confirm the peaceful aspirations of the Soviet Union".

"Our military construction is intended exclusively for defence against an outside aggression. And it cannot be otherwise in the country where the lessons of the bloody battle against fascism are not forgotten."